Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_S0-EHE-077

C. L. Dows

The
International Critical Commentary
on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

UNDER THE EDITORSHIP OF

THE REV. SAMUEL ROLLES DRIVER, D.D., D.LITT.,
Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford;

THE REV. ALFRED PLUMMER, M.A., D.D.,
Late Master of University College, Durham:

AND

THE REV. CHARLES AUGUSTUS BRIGGS, D.D., D.LITT.
Professor of Theological Encyclopædia and Symbolics,
Union Theological Seminary, New York.

BS
491
.I6
V.26

THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY

A
CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY
ON
MICAH, ZEPHANIAH, NAHUM, HABAKKUK, OBADIAH AND JOEL

BY

JOHN MERLIN POWIS SMITH, PH.D.
WILLIAM HAYES WARD, D.D., LL.D.
JULIUS A. BEWER, PH.D.

CONCORDIA COLLEGE LIBRARY
BRONXVILLE. N. Y. 10708

66972

EDINBURGH
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED
FOR
T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH
NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

First Published . . .	*November 1911*
Second Impression . . .	*November 1928*
Third Impression . . .	*May 1948*
Fourth Impression . . .	*January 1959*

PREFACE.

IN 1890 the late Pres. William R. Harper agreed to write a commentary on the Minor Prophets in two volumes for this series of commentaries. But later on this was found to be impracticable, and it was agreed to allow him three volumes for the work. The first volume, containing Amos and Hosea, was published in 1905. Dr. Harper was at work upon the second volume when he was taken from us by death. His pupil and associate, Prof. J. M. Powis Smith, who had assisted him in his preliminary studies, was asked to complete the commentary on Micah and now assumes the entire responsibility for that work. He wishes to make grateful acknowledgment of his indebtedness to the late Pres. William R. Harper for invaluable inspiration and much help in the work on Micah, and to Mrs. William R. Harper for the free use of Dr. Harper's papers and books and for permission to incorporate some of his results in the present commentary. These appear chiefly in the general comments on Micah, chs. 1 and 2 and 6^{1-8}.

The delay in the preparation of the volumes was so great that it seemed best to distribute the work remaining to be done among several scholars. Accordingly, Zephaniah and Nahum were undertaken by Prof. Charles P. Fagnani, who, however, was obliged after some years to give them up on account of ill health, when Prof. J. M. Powis Smith kindly assumed the task. Habakkuk was assigned to Dr. W. Hayes Ward, Obadiah and Joel to Prof. Julius A. Bewer. These six prophets are published in this volume. The remaining prophets, Haggai and Zechariah by Prof. Henry G. Mitchell, Malachi by Prof. J. M. Powis Smith, and Jonah by Prof. Julius A. Bewer, will be published soon in a third volume completing the commentaries on the Minor Prophets.

The order of arrangement of the Minor Prophets in these volumes differs, not only from the traditional arrangement found in our Bibles, but also from that proposed by Dr. Harper in his original plan. Dr. Harper departed from the traditional arrangement in his volume by placing Amos before Hosea, and also in his plan for the remaining volumes stated in the preface of his commentary. The traditional arrangement was not a chronological one, even from the point of view of traditional theories of authorship, and from the point of view of modern criticism it has little if any propriety. It would be exceedingly difficult and, so far as the editors are concerned, impracticable to insist upon any chronological scheme, especially in view of the great number of different writings of different dates combined under the names of these Minor Prophets, where indeed there is ample room for differences of opinion. We were compelled therefore to consider the views of the several authors, and at the same time respect the traditional arrangement wherever practicable. The order finally agreed upon in this commentary is not therefore an ideal one, but the best that we could make under all the circumstances.

The several authors have their own special preferences in doing their work, and there are therefore differences in these commentaries such as would have been avoided if any one author had composed them all. All the commentaries, however, conform to the general plan of the series.

It was thought best to publish the work of the several authors under separate sub-titles, each with its own separate pagination. This volume is thus really composed of three little volumes bound in one, each author being responsible only for his own work. The editors are not responsible for the opinions of the authors or for the details of their work, but only for the choice of the authors and such general supervision of their work as to insure its conformity to the plan of the series.

CONTENTS

PAGE
PREFACE . . . . iii–iv

ABBREVIATIONS . . . . v–xvii

INTRODUCTION TO MICAH 5–29
§ 1. The Book of Micah 5–16
  1. The Text 5–6
  2. The Style 6
  3. Poetic Form 6–8
  4. Component Parts 8–16
  5. The Formation of the Book of Micah . 16
§ 2. The Prophet Micah 17–19
  1. His Name 17
  2. His Home 17–18
  3. His Character 18–19
§ 3. The Times of Micah 19–23
  1. The Date of His Prophecies 19–21
  2. The Background of Chs. 1–3 21–23
§ 4. The Message of Micah 23–26
§ 5. Recent Literature on the Book of Micah . . . 26–29

COMMENTARY ON MICAH 30–156

INTRODUCTION TO ZEPHANIAH 159–181
§ 1. From the Fall of Thebes to the Fall of Nineveh 159–165
§ 2. Zephaniah and His Times 166–171
  1. The Man 166–167
  2. The Times 167–171
§ 3. The Book of Zephaniah 171–176
  1. The Contents 171–172
  2. Later Additions 172–174
  3. Poetic Form 174–176
§ 4. The Message of Zephaniah 177–180
§ 5. Literature on the Book of Zephaniah 180–181

PAGE
COMMENTARY ON ZEPHANIAH 182–263

INTRODUCTION TO NAHUM 267–283
§ 1. The Book of Nahum 267–274
Its Contents 267–268
Its Unity 268–270
Its Poetic Form 270–274
§ 2. The Times of Nahum 274–279
§ 3. The Man and the Message 279–282
The Man 279–280
The Message 280–282
§ 4. Literature on the Book of Nahum 282–283

COMMENTARY ON NAHUM 284–360

INDEXES TO MICAH, ZEPHANIAH AND NAHUM . . 361–363
I. Index of Hebrew Words 361
II. Index of Subjects 362–363

INTRODUCTION TO HABAKKUK 3–7
Authorship and Date 3–7
Topical Analysis 7

COMMENTARY ON HABAKKUK 8–28

INTRODUCTION TO OBADIAH 3–18
§ 1. The Composition of the Book 3–5
§ 2. The Date of the Book 6–9
§ 3. The Interpretation of the Book 10–13
§ 4. The Prophet and His Book 13–14
§ 5. The Text 15
§ 6. The Metre 15–17
§ 7. Modern Literature 17–18

COMMENTARY ON OBADIAH 19–46

INTRODUCTION TO JOEL 49–72
§ 1. The Composition of the Book 49–56
§ 2. The Date of the Book 56–62
§ 3. The Interpretation of the Book 62–67
§ 4. The Prophet 67–68
§ 5. The Text and Metre 68–71
§ 6. Modern Literature 71–72

COMMENTARY ON JOEL 73–144

INDEXES TO OBADIAH AND JOEL 145–146

ABBREVIATIONS

I. TEXTS AND VERSIONS

$\mathfrak{A}$ = Arabic Version.
Aq. = Aquila's translation, cited from Field's *Hexapla*.
Arm. = Armenian Version.
AV. = Authorized Version (1611).

Bab. Cod. = *Prophetarum posteriorum codex Babylonicus Petropolitanus*. Ed. H. L. Strack (1876).

E′ = Origen's *Quinta*.
Eth. = Ethiopic Version.

$\mathfrak{G}$ = The Septuagint, in the received Greek Version.
$\mathfrak{G}^{A}$ = Codex Alexandrinus.
$\mathfrak{G}^{Ald.}$ = Aldine Text.
$\mathfrak{G}^{\aleph}$ = Codex Sinaiticus.
$\mathfrak{G}^{B}$ = Codex Vaticanus.
$\mathfrak{G}^{Q}$ = Codex Marchalianus.
$\mathfrak{G}^{Y}$ = Codex Taurinensis.

HP. = Texts of Holmes and Parsons.

$\mathfrak{J}$ = Jerome's Version.

Kenn. = R. Kennicott, *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum cum variis lectionibus* (1776–80).
Kt. = K^{e}thîbh.

$\mathfrak{L}$ = The Old Latin Text of the Minor Prophets, cited from Oesterley's edition in *the Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. V (1903).

Lu. = Luther's Version.

$\mathfrak{M}$ = The Massoretic Text.
Mas. = Masora.

NT. = New Testament.

OT. = Old Testament.

Qr. = Q^{e}rî.

RV. = Revised Version.
RVm. = Revised Version, margin.

$\mathfrak{S}$ = The Peshitto, cited from the Paris Polyglot.
$\mathfrak{S}^{H}$ = Syro Hexaplar text.
Slav. = Slavic Version.
Σ = Symmachus's translation, cited from Field's *Hexapla*.

$\mathfrak{T}$ = The Targum, cited from the Paris Polyglot.
Θ = Theodotion's translation, cited from Field's *Hexapla*.

$\mathfrak{V}$ = The Vulgate, cited from Hetzenauer, *Biblia Sacra Vulgatæ Editionis* (1906).
Vrss. = Versions.

II. BOOKS OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS

Am. = Amos

BS. = The Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sira, or Ecclesiasticus.

1, 2 Ch. = 1, 2 Chronicles.
Col. = Colossians.
1, 2 Cor. = 1, 2 Corinthians.
Ct. = Canticles = The Song of Songs.

Dn. = Daniel.
Dt. = Deuteronomy.

Ec. = Ecclesiastes.
Eph. = Ephesians.
1, 2 Esd. = 1, 2 Esdras.
Est. = Esther.
Ex. = Exodus.
Ez. = Ezekiel.
Ezr. = Ezra.

Gal. = Galatians.
Gn. = Genesis.

Hb. = Habakkuk.
Heb. = Hebrews.
Hg. = Haggai.
Ho. = Hosea.

Is. = Isaiah.

Jb. = Job.
Je. = Jeremiah.
Jn. = John.
Jo. = Joel.
Jon. = Jonah.
Jos. = Joshua.
Ju. = Judges.
Jud. = Judith.
1, 2 K. = 1, 2 Kings.

La. = Lamentations.
Lk. = Luke.
Lv. = Leviticus.

Mal. = Malachi.
1, 2 Mac. = 1, 2 Maccabees.
Mi. = Micah.
Mk. = Mark.
Mt. = Matthew.

Na. = Nahum.
Ne. = Nehemiah.
Nu. = Numbers.

Ob. = Obadiah.

Phil. = Philippians.
Pr. = Proverbs.
Ps. = Psalms.

Rev. = Revelation.
Rom. = Romans.
Ru. = Ruth.

1, 2 S. = 1, 2 Samuel.

1, 2 Thes. = 1, 2 Thessalonians.
1, 2 Tim. = 1, 2 Timothy.
Tob. = Tobit.

Wisd. = Wisdom of Solomon.

Zc. = Zechariah.
Zp. = Zephaniah.

III. AUTHORS AND WRITINGS

Abar. = Rabbi Izaak ben Juda Abarbanel (†1508).

AE. = Rabbi Abraham ben Meir ibn Ezra (†1167)

AJSL. = *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures.*
AJTh. = *American Journal of Theology.*
AOF. = *Altorientalische Forschungen*, von H. Winckler.
Arn. = W. R. Arnold, *The Composition of Na.* 1^1–2^3, *ZAW.*, XXI, 225–65.
Bach. = J. Bachmann, *Zur Text-Kritik des Propheten Zephanja*, in *SK.*, 1894, pp. 641–55.
Bae. = F. Baethgen.
Barth, *NB.* = J. Barth, *Die Nominalbildung in den Semitischen Sprachen* (1889–91).
Bart. = G. A. Barton.
BAS. = *Beiträge zur Assyriologie und Semitischen Sprachwissenschaft.*
Bauer = G. L. Bauer, *Die kleinen Propheten übersetzt u. s. w.* (1786).
BDB. = *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, with an Appendix containing the Biblical Aramaic, based on the Lexicon of William Gesenius as translated by Edward Robinson*, edited by Francis Brown, with the co-operation of S. R. Driver and Charles A. Briggs (1891–1906).
Beer = Article *Zephanja*, in *PRE.*^{3}
Bew. = J. A. Bewer.
Bick. = G. Bickell, *Beiträge zur semit. Metrik* (1894).
Bick.^{1} = *Idem*, in *ZDMG.*, XXXIV (1880), 559 *ff.* or *Carmina Vet. Test. Metrice* (1882), 212 *f.*
Boch. = S. Bochart.
Bö. = F. Böttcher.
Br. = Breiteneicher, *Ninive und Nahum* (1861).
Brd. = C. J. Bredenkamp.
Bu. = K. Budde.
Bu.$^{\text{Gesch.}}$ = *Idem*, *Geschichte der althebräischen Litteratur* (1906).
Cal. = Calvin's Commentaries on the Twelve Minor Prophets.
Casp. = Caspari, *Der Prophet Obadja*, 1842; *Ueber Micha den Morasthiten und seine prophetische Schrift* (1852).
CB. = *Critica Biblica*, Part II: *Ezekiel and Minor Prophets*, by T. K. Cheyne (1903).
Che. = T. K. Cheyne, *Micah* [*Cambridge Bible*, 1882].
CIS. = *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum.*
Con. = R. P. Condamin.
Cor. = C. H. Cornill, *Einleitung in die kanonischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*

Cor.—*Continued.* (6th ed., 1908; Eng. transl. of the 5th ed. = *Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament*, 1907).

COT. = *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the OT.* (Eng. trans. *KAT.*^{2}).

Cred. = K. A. Credner.

Dathe = J. A. Dathe, *Prophetæ minores ex recensione textus Hebraei et versionum antiquarum . . . illustrati* (1773).

Dav. = A. B. Davidson.

DB. = *A Dictionary of the Bible*, edited by James Hastings, 4 vols. (1898–1902) and an "Extra Volume" (1904), cited here as vol. V.

De. = Franz Delitzsch.

de R. = J. B. de Rossi, *Variæ lectiones Veteris Testamenti, etc.*, vol. III (1786); and *Scholia critica in Veteris Testamenti libros* (1798).

de W. = W. M. L. de Wette.

Dl. = Friedrich Delitzsch.

Dl.$^{\text{Prol.}}$ = *Idem, Prolegomena eines neuen Hebräisch-Aramäischen Wörterbuchs zum Alten Testaments* (1886).

Dl.$^{\text{HWB}}$ = *Idem, Assyrisches Handwörterbuch.*

Dr. = S. R. Driver, *The Minor Prophets: Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. Introductions, Revised Version, with Notes, Index, and Map* [*The Century Bible*, 1906].

Dr.§ = *Idem, A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew* (1874; 3d ed., 1892).

Dr.$^{\text{Intr.}}$ = *Idem, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (Revised ed., 1910).

Dru. = Drusius, *Commentary on Minor Prophets*, in *Critici Sacri, etc.* (1660).

Du. = B. Duhm, *Die zwölf Propheten in den Versmassen der Urschrift übersetzt* (1910).

EB. = *Encyclopædia Biblica*, ed. by T. K. Cheyne and J. Sutherland Black, 4 vols. (1899–1903).

Ehr. = A. B. Ehrlich.

Eich. = J. G. Eichhorn.

Einl. = *Einleitung in das Alte Testament.*

Elh. = H. J. Elhorst, *De prophetie van Micha* (1891).

Enc. Brit. = *Encyclopædia Britannica* (9th ed.).

Eus. = Eusebius.

Ew. = H. Ewald, *Die Propheten des Alten Bundes* (1840; 2d ed., 1867; transl. as *Commentary on the Prophets of the Old Testament*; 5 vols., 1875–81).

Ew.§ = *Idem*, *Ausführliches Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Sprache des Alten Bundes* (8th ed., 1870).

Exp. = *The Expositor*, ed. by W. R. Nicoll.

Expos. T. = *The Expository Times.*

Fag. = C. P. Fagnani, *The Structure of the Text of the Book of Zephaniah*, in *Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of W. R. Harper*, II, 260–77.

GASm. = George Adam Smith, *The Book of the Twelve Prophets* (1897–98).

Geb. = Gebhard, *Gründliche Einleitung in die zwölf kleinen Propheten* (1737).

Ges. = Wilhelm Gesenius.

Ges.§ = Wilhelm Gesenius's *Hebräische Grammatik*, völlig umgearbeitet von E. Kautzsch (1909^{28}). English trans. by Collins and Cowley, 1910^{2}.

Gie. = F. Giesebrecht.

Gr. = H. Graetz, *Emendationes in plerosque Sacræ Scripturæ Veteris Testamenti libros, etc.* (1893).

Gray = G. B. Gray.

Gre. = E. J. Greve, *Vaticinia Nahumi et Hab., editio metrica* (1793).

Grimm = K. J. Grimm, *Euphemistic Liturgical Appendices in the Old Testament* (1901).

Grotius = *Annotata ad Vet. Test.*, vol. II (1644).

Gu. = H. Guthe, *Der Prophet Micha*, in Kautzsch, *Heilige Schrift* (3d ed., 1909).

Gunk. = H. Gunkel, *Schöpfung u. Chaos in Urzeit u. Endzeit* (1895).

H.§ = W. R. Harper, *Elements of Hebrew Syntax* (1888; 5th ed., 1899).

H.^{AH} = *Idem*, *Commentary on Amos and Hosea*, *ICC.*, 1905.

Hal. = J. Halévy, *Recherches bibliques: Le livre de Michée; Le livre d' Obadia*, in *Revue Sémitique*, vols. XII and XIII (1904 *f.*). *Le Livre de Nahum*, *ibid.*, vol. XIII; *Le livre de*

Hal.—*Continued.* *Sophonie, ibid.*, vol. XIII.

Hap. = O. Happel, *Das Buch d. Proph. Nahum* (1902).

Hartmann = *Micha neu übersetzt und erläutert* (1800).

HC. = *Kurzer Handcommentar zum AT.*

Hd. = E. Henderson, *The Book of the Twelve Minor Prophets translated, etc.* (1868).

Hdt. = Herodotus.

Hesselberg = *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten ausgelegt* (1838).

Hi. = F. Hitzig, *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten* (1838; 4th ed. by Steiner, 1881).

Holz. = H. Holzinger.

Houb. = C. F. Houbigant, *Biblia Hebraica cum notis criticis, etc.*, 4 vols. (1753).

Hpt. = (1) Paul Haupt, *Notes on Micah*, in *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, July and Oct., 1910.
= (2) *The Book of Nahum*, in *JBL.*, XXVI (1907), 1–53.

HWB.^{15} = Gesenius's *Hebr. und aram. Handwörterbuch über das AT.*, ed. F. Buhl.

ICC. = *International Critical Commentary*, edited by C. A. Briggs, S. R. Driver, and A. Plummer.

JAOS. = *Journal of the American Oriental Society.*

JBL. = *Journal of Biblical Literature.*

JE. = *Jewish Encyclopædia.*

Jer. = Jerome (†420).

JMPS. = J. M. Powis Smith.

Jos. = Fl. Josephus.

Jos.$^{\text{Ant.}}$ = *Idem, Antiquities.*

Jos.$^{\text{BJ}}$ = *Idem, Bell. Jud.*

JQR. = *Jewish Quarterly Review.*

JRAS. = *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.*

Jrm. = A. Jeremias, in *BAS.*, III.

JTS. = *Journal of Theological Studies.*

Jus. = K. W. Justi, *Micha neu übersetzt und erläutert* (1799; 2d ed., 1820).

Kalinsky = *Vaticinia Habacuci et Nahumi, etc.* (1748).

KAT.^{3} = *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, von Eb. Schrader. Dritte Auflage . . . neu bearbeitet von H. Zimmern und H. Winckler (1902).

Kau. = E. Kautzsch, *Die heilige Schrift d. AT.*^{3}

KB. = *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek.*

Ke. = C. F. Keil, Commentary on the Minor Prophets in Keil und Delitzsch, *Bibl. Kommentar*, vol. IV (1866; transl. 1880).

Kent = C. F. Kent, *The Sermons, Epistles and Apocalypses of Israel's Prophets, etc.* [Student's Old Testament, 1910].

Ki. = Rabbi David Kimchi (†1230).

Kirk. = A. F. Kirkpatrick.

Kit. = R. Kittel.

Kl. = Paul Kleinert, Commentaries on Micah, Nahum, and Zephaniah in Lange's *Bibelwerk* (1868; Eng. transl. 1874).

Knabenbauer = *Com. in proph. minores* (1886).

Kö = Ed. König, *Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der Hebräischen Sprache*, vols. I–III (1881–97); reference is made to the *Syntax* (vol. III, 1897) unless otherwise indicated.

Kol. = A. Kolmodin, *Profeten Nahum, Öfversättning och Utläggning* (1898).

Kre. = E. Kreenen, *Nahumi Vaticinium philolog. et crit. Expositum* (1808).

Kue. = Abraham Kuenen.

Lag. = P. de Lagarde.

Löhr = Max Löhr, *Zwei Beispiele von Kehrvers in den Prophetenschriften des Alten Testaments*, in *ZDMG.*, LXI (1907), pp. 3–6.

Marg. = Max L. Margolis, *Micah* [*The Holy Scriptures with Commentary*, 1908].

Marti = K. Marti, *Dodekapropheton* [*Kurzer Handcommentar zum Alten Testament*, 1903].

Mau. = Maurer, *Commentarius grammaticus historicus criticus in prophetas minores* (1840).

Me. = A. Merx.

Mich. = J. D. Michaelis, *Deutsche Uebersetzung des Alten Testaments u.s.w.* (1782).

Mich., C. B. = C. B. Michaelis, on Obadiah and Micah, in J. H. Michaelis's *Biblia Hebraica cum Annott.* (1720).

Mich., J. B. = J. B. Michaelis.

Mich., J. H. = J. H. Michaelis, *Biblia Hebraica, etc.*

MVAG. = *Mittheilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft.*

NCB. = *New Century Bible.*

New. = Newcome, *An Attempt towards an Improved Version, Metrical Arrangement and Explanation of the Twelve Minor Prophets* (1836).

Nö. = Theodor Nöldeke.

Now. = W. Nowack, *Die kleinen Propheten übersetzt und erklärt* [*Handkommentar zum Alten Testament*, 1897; 2d ed., 1903].

Now.^{K} = *Idem*, *Duodecim Prophetæ,* in R. Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* (1906).

Ols. = J. Olshausen.

OLZ. = *Orientalistische Literatur-Zeitung.*

Onom. = *Onomastica Sacra*, ed. Lagarde.

Oort$^{Em.}$ = H. Oort, *Textus Hebraici Emendationes, etc.* (1900).

Or. = C. von Orelli, *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten ausgelegt* (1888; 3d ed., 1908; Engl. transl., 1893).

Os. = Osiander, *Ezechiel, Daniel, Osee, Joel, Amos, etc., juxta veterem seu Vulgatam translationem ad Hebræam veritatem emendati, etc.* (1579).

Perles = F. Perles, *Analekten zur Textkritik des Alten Testaments* (1895).

Pet. = Norbert Peters.

Pont = J. W. Pont, *Micha-Studiën*, in *Theologische Studiën* (1888–89, 1892).

PRE. = Herzog's *Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche.*[3]

PSBA. = *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology.*

Pu. = E. B. Pusey, *The Minor Prophets, with a Commentary* (1865 *f.*).

Ra. = Rashi (Jarchi †1105).

RB. = *Revue biblique.*

Reinke = (1) *Der Prophet Zephanja* (1868).
= (2) *Zur Kritik der älteren Versionen des Proph. Nahum* (1867).

Reuss = *Das Alte Testament übersetzt, eingeleitet und erläutert.* Band II: *Die Propheten* (1892).

Ri. = E. Riehm, *Handwörterbuch d. bibl. Alterthums.*

Ro. = T. Roorda, *Commentarius in Vaticinium Michae* (1869).

Rosenm. = C. F. K. Rosenmüller, *Scholia in prophetas minores* (1836).

Roth. = J. W. Rothstein, Translation of

Roth.—*Continued.* Zephaniah with notes, in Kautzsch's *Heilige Schrift*.^{3}

Rub. = P. Ruben, *Critical Remarks upon Some Passages of the Old Testament* (1896).

Ry = V. Ryssel, *Untersuchungen über die Textgestalt und die Echtheit des Buches Micha. Ein kritischer Kommentar zu Micha* (1887).

Sanctius = *Com. in proph. minores* (1621).

Say. = A. H. Sayce.

Schegg = P. Schegg, *Die kleinen Propheten übersetzt und erklärt* (1854 *ff.*).

Schleus. = J. F. Schleusner, *Opuscula critica ad versiones Græcas Veteris Testamenti pertinentia* (1812).

Schnurrer = *Animadversiones philologicæ criticæ ad vaticinium Michae* (1798).

Schw. = F. Schwally, *Das Buch Ssefanyâ, eine historisch-kritische Untersuchung*, in *ZAW.*, X (1890), 165–240.

Seb. = M. Sebök, *Die Syrische Uebersetzung der zwölf kleinen Propheten u. s. w.* (1887).

Siev. = Ed. Sievers, *Metrische Studien;* Alttestamentliche Miscellen: 6. *Zu Joel;* 7. *Zu Obadia;* 8. *Zu Zephanja.* 10. *Zu Micha* [*Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlichen Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig. Philologisch-historische Klasse*, Band LIX, 1907].

Sm. = R. Smend, *Lehrbuch der Alttestamentlichen Religionsgeschichte* (1893; 2d ed., 1899).

SS. = C. Siegfried und B. Stade, *Hebräisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testamente* (1893).

Sta. = B. Stade (†1906).

Sta.$^{\text{GVI}}$ = *Idem*, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (1887).

Sta.§ = *Idem*, *Lehrbuch der Hebr. Grammatik* (1879).

Stei. = H. Steiner (see *s. v.* Hi.).

Stek. = Schuurmans Stekhoven, *De Alexandrijnsche Vertaling van het Dodekapropheton* (1887).

Stk. = (1) W. Staerk, *Das Assyrische Weltreich im Urteil der*

Stk.—*Continued*

Propheten (1908). For reff. in Micah.

(2) *Idem, Ausgewählte poetische Texte des Alten Testaments in metrischer und strophischer Gliederung zum Gebrauch in Vorlesungen und in Seminarübungen und zum Selbststudium.* Heft 2: *Amos, Nahum, Habakkuk* (1908).

Strauss = *Nahumi de Nino Vaticinium* (1853).

Struensee = *Neue Uebersetzung der Weissagungen Jesaias, Joel, Amos, Obadja und Micha nach dem Ebräischen Text mit Zuziehung der griechischen Version* (1773).

Taylor = John Taylor, *The Massoretic Text and the Ancient Versions of the Book of Micah* (1891).

Theiner = *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten* (1828).

ThLZ. = *Theologische Litteratur-Zeitung.*

ThStk. = *Theologische Studien und Kritiken.*

ThT. = *Theologisch Tijdschrift.*

Um. = Umbreit, *Praktischer Commentar über die kleinen Propheten* (1844).

van H. = A. van Hoonacker *Les douze petits prophètes* (1908).

Vern. = M. Vernes.

Vol. = K. Vollers, *Das Dodekapropheton der Alexandriner,* in *ZAW.*, IV (1884).

Volz = *Die vorexilische Jahweprophetie und der Messias* (1897).

We. = J. Wellhausen, *Die kleinen Propheten übersetzt und erklärt* (1892; 3d ed., 1898).

Wkl. = H. Winckler.

Wkl.$^{\text{Unt.}}$ = *Idem, Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen* (1892).

WRS. = W. Robertson Smith, *The Prophets of Israel* (1882; new ed., with Introduction by T. K. Cheyne, 1895).

WRS.$^{\text{Rel.}}$ = *Idem, Lectures on the Religion of the Semites* (2d ed., 1894).

Wü. = A. Wünsche.

ZA. = *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie.*

ZAW.; *ZATW.* = *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.*

ZDMG. = *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft.*

Zim. = H. Zimmern.

Zö. = Otto Zöckler.

ZwTh. = *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie.*

IV. GENERAL, ESPECIALLY GRAMMATICAL

abs. = absolute.
abstr. = abstract.
acc. = accusative.
acc. cog. = cognate acc.
acc. pers. = acc. of person.
acc. rei. = acc. of thing.
acc. to = according to.
act. = active.
add. = added, addition, additional.
adj. = adjective.
ad loc. = *ad locum.*
adv. = adverb, adverbial.
ἅπ. = *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον*, word or phr. used once.
alw. = always.
apod. = apodosis.
Ar. = Arabic.
Aram. = Aramaic, Aramean.
art. = article.
Assy. = Assyria, Assyrian.

Bab. = Babylonian.
b. Aram. = biblical Aramaic.
bibl. = biblical.

ch., chs. = chapter, chapters.
c. = *circa*, about.
caus. = causative.
cent. = century.
cf. = *confer*, compare.
cod., codd. = codex, codices.
cog. = cognate.
cohort. = cohortative.
coll. = collective.
com. = commentary, commentators.
concr. = concrete.
conj. = conjunction.
cons. = consonantal.
consec. = consecutive.
constr. = construction.
cp. = compare.
crit. = critical, criticism.
cstr. = construct.

d. f. = daghesh forte.
def. = defective.
del. = *dele*, strike out.
diff. = different, difference.
dittog. = dittography.
dub. = dubious, doubtful.

ed. = edition, editor, editorial.
e. g. = for example.
elsw. = elsewhere.
esp. = especially.
et al. = *et aliter*, and elsewhere, or *et alii*, and others.
Eth. = Ethiopic.
exc. = except.

f., *ff.* = and following.
fem. = feminine.
fig. = figurative.
f. n. = foot-note.
foll. = following.
freq. = frequentative.
fut. = future.

gen. = genitive.
gent. = gentilic.
Gk. = Greek.
gram. = grammatical.

haplo. = haplography.
Heb. = Hebrew.
Hiph. = Hiphil of verb.
hist. = historical.
Hithp. = Hithpael of verb.

id. = *idem*, the same.
i. e. = *id est*, that is.
impf. = imperfect.
imv. = imperative.
indef. = indefinite.

inf. = infinitive.
ins. = inscription, inscriptions.
intrans. = intransitive.
Intro. = Introduction, introductory.

juss. = jussive.

l., ll. = line, lines.
l. c. = *loco citato*, in the place before cited.
lit. = literal, literally.

marg. = margin, marginal.
masc. = masculine.
metr. = metrical.
mod. = modern.
ms., mss. = manuscript, manuscripts.
mt. = mount(ain).
mtr. cs. = *metrica causa*, because of the metre.

N. = North, northern.
n. = note.
NH. = New Hebrew.
Niph. = Niphal of verb.

obj. = object.
oft. = often.
om. = omit.
orig. = original.

p., pp. = page, pages.
part. = particle.
parall. = parallelism.
pass. = passive.
pers. = person.
perh. = perhaps
pf. = perfect.
Pi. = Piel of verb.
pl. = plural.
pred. = predicate.
preg. = pregnant.
prep. = preposition.
prob. = probable, probably.
pron. = pronoun.
proph. = prophet, prophetic.
prtc. = participle.
Pu. = Pual of verb.

q. v. = *quod vide*, which see.

rd. = read.
refl. = reflexive.
rel. = relative.
rm. = remark.

S. = South, southern.
Sab. = Sabean.
sf. = suffix.
sg. = singular.
sq. = followed by.
st. = state.
str. = strophe, strophical.
subj. = subject.
subst. = substantive.
Syr. = Syriac.
s. v. = *sub voce.*

t. = times (following a number).

tr. = transpose.
trans. = transitive.
transl. = translate, translation.
text. = textual.

v., vv. = verse, verses.
v. = *vide*, see.
vb. = verb.
v. i. = *vide infra*, see below (usually textual note on same verse).
viz. = *videlicet*, namely, to wit.
voc. = vocative.
vol. = volume.
vs. = *versus*, against.
v. s. = *vide supra*, see above (usually general remark on same verse).

V. OTHER SIGNS

†	indicates all passages cited.
||	parallel, of words or clauses chiefly synonymous.
=	equivalent, equals.
+	plus, denotes that other passages might be cited.
√	= the root, or stem.
′	= sign of abbreviation in Hebrew words.
וגו׳	= וְגוֹמֵר, and so forth.
י׳	= Yahweh.
*	indicates that Massoretic text has not been followed, but either Vrss. or conjectural emendations.

Biblical passages are cited according to the Hebrew enumeration of chapters and verses: where this differs in the English, the reference to the latter has usually (except in textual notes) been added in parentheses.

A
CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL
COMMENTARY

ON THE BOOKS OF

MICAH, ZEPHANIAH
AND NAHUM

BY

JOHN MERLIN POWIS SMITH, Ph.D.
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

INTRODUCTION TO MICAH.

§ 1. THE BOOK OF MICAH.

1. *The Text.*

The book of Micah stands sixth in the list of the Minor Prophets as given in the Hebrew Bible, but third as found in 𝔊. The text has come down to us in a bad state of corruption. Of the Minor Prophets, Hosea alone has a worse text. In the following commentary, it has been found necessary to make more than eighty corrections of the text as found in 𝔐, in order to secure satisfactory sense. Almost half of the errors are in chs. 1 and 2, while chs. 4 and 5 are remarkably free from them.

Text

In the correction of 𝔐, 𝔊 is of the most value. It offers a larger number of textual variants than all of the remaining versions combined. In many cases the text presupposed by 𝔊's rendering is superior to 𝔐. More than one-third of the emendations here adopted are based upon 𝔊. 𝔖 affords relatively little help, being chiefly dependent upon 𝔊. Only seven corrections are made on the basis of 𝔖, apart from 𝔊. 𝔙 and Aq. furnish one each. The characteristics of the various versions of Micah are in general the same as in the case of Amos and Hosea. *Cf.* H.$^{\text{AH.}}$, clxxiii–clxxvi. Certainly 𝔊's rendering of the Minor Prophets as a whole seems to be the work of one translator throughout.

The errors of 𝔐 are those which commonly appear in the transmission of texts, viz., wrong division of words, *e. g.*, 2^{10} 6^{9}; dittography, *e. g.*, 2^{3} 5^{1} 6^{10}; haplography, *e. g.*, $5^{1.\ 4}$ 7^{4}; wrong pointing, *e. g.*, $1^{5.\ 9}$ 3^{10} 5^{8}; confusion of similar consonants, *e. g.*, $1^{11.\ 12}$ 5^{4} 7^{4}; transposition of words or phrases, *e. g.*, 2^{4} 4^{8}; confusion of suffixes, *e. g.*, 2^{9} 7^{19}; and deliberate theological change, *e. g.*, 1^{5}. But the source of some corruptions is inexplicable, *e. g.*, 7^3. The preponderance of errors in chs. 1–3 is due partly to the large number of proper names in this material, partly to the greater age of this portion of the prophecy and probably also in part to the denunciatory character of the message which later editors sought to soften.

2. *The Style.*

tyle

The style of Micah, as revealed in chs. 1–3, is direct and forceful. It is characterised by rapidity of movement, picturesque phraseology, vivid description and boldness of utterance. It reflects clearness of vision, keen insight and profound feeling. At first sight, this seems inconsistent with the indulgence in paronomasia found in $1^{10\text{ ff.}}$; but the Hebrew prophets were able to couch their most biting denunciations in this form. *Cf.* Is. $3^{16\text{ ff.}}$.

The logical development within each prophecy in chs. 1–3 is also admirable. Not only so, but there is an evident logical progress in the succession of the various prophecies constituting these chapters.

Upon leaving this section of the book, the atmosphere changes. With few exceptions, the style becomes less forceful and direct. It loses in vividness and passion. The contrast is something like that existing between Isaiah, chs. 40 *ff.*, and the genuine utterances of Isaiah. The movement is calm and placid and the tone reflective rather than denunciatory. But there is greater variety and unevenness of style in chs. 4–6 than in chs. 1–3.

3. *Poetic Form.*

Poetic Form

That the book of Micah is in poetic form is indisputable. Yet relatively little attention has been bestowed upon this phase of its study.

Ewald (1840) contributed a strophical analysis of the book. Francis Brown (*JBL.*, 1890, pp. 71–82) used Micah, chs. 1–3 and $7^{11\text{-}20}$, to illustrate the value of poetic form as a consideration in the determination of the composite character of a writing. In 1891, Elhorst presented a strophic reorganisation of the prophecy involving revolutionary transpositions and intended as a defence of the unity of the book. D. H. Müller, in *Die Propheten in ihrer ursprünglichen Form* (1896), treated chs. 3, 5^{6-14} and 7 to an application of his complicated theory of strophe, antistrophe, responsion, inclusion, concatenation, etc.. Sievers included ch. 1 in his *Studien zur hebräischen Metrik* (1901), where he showed too great respect toward 𝔐. François Ladame reconstructed chs. 4 and 5, according to the theory of Müller and Zenner, in the *Revue de theologie et de philosophie* for 1902. Condamin, belonging to the same school of metricists, would place $2^{12.\ 13}$ after 4^{6}; see *RB.*, XI (1902), 383–6. Duhm, in *EB.*, III (1902), 3800, arranged 3^{9-12} poetically. Marti makes the poetic and strophic form the basis of his commentary (1904). Löhr presents $3^{1-4.\ 9-12}$ as a literary and poetic unit in *ZDMG.*, LXI (1907), 3–6. Sievers, in his *Alttestamentliche Miscellen*, published in *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königl. Sächsischen Gesellschaft zu Wissenschaften*, LIX (1907), 76–109, applies his metrical system to the whole book of Micah. Here he casts veneration for 𝔐 to the winds and, on the basis of Marti's critical conclusions, reconstructs the text in accordance with the requirements of his system. The conclusions concerning the poetic form of Micah which are incorporated in the following commentary have already appeared in J. M. P. Smith's *Strophic Structure of the Book of Micah*, published in *Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of William Rainey Harper*, II (1908), 415–438, and also in *AJSL.*, XXIV (1908), 187–208. Since that publication there has appeared P. Haupt's *Critical Notes on Micah*, *AJSL.*, July and October, 1910, containing a strophical reconstruction of the text. But Haupt's rearrangement is so subjective and arbitrary as almost to warrant the suspicion that he regards the book of Micah as a quarry from which stones may be hewed for any kind of a building. B. Duhm has also published a poetical version of Micah in *Die zwölf Propheten in den Versmassen der Urschrift übersetzt* (1910); in this too much insistence is laid upon the necessity of four-lined strs..

No attempt is made here to stretch the text of Micah upon the Procrustaean bed of a metrical system. Neither Bickell, Grimme, Sievers nor Rothstein seems as yet to have evolved a system that does not do violence to the text. In the present stage of metrical study, certainly no existing system can be accepted as a safe guide to the nature and form of Hebrew poetry. The reconstruction here presented aims to follow the guidance of the parallelism and the logic. On the basis of the former, lines are discovered which are of approximately equal length, measured by the number of tones, or accents, in the line. The same length of line persists in general throughout a given piece. The constantly recurring measures are trimeter, tetrameter and pentameter, with frequent dimeters. There is less evenness and regularity in the length of lines than in Amos, but close affinity with Hosea in this respect. There is no marked difference in metre between the three main sections of the book.

The logical development of the thought within a given piece resolves itself into a number of thought-groups, *i.e.*, strophes, each with a given number of lines. The four-line strophe prevails in the greater part of the book, in chs. 1–3 there being only three strophes of different length, and in chs. 6 and 7 only one. In chs. 4 and 5 the six-line strophe prevails. There are in all nine strophes of six lines each, three of eight lines each and one of ten lines. The poetic form will be found frequently to have added another argument in favour of critical conclusions already arrived at upon the basis of other considerations. Only rarely has it been used in this commentary as an argument sufficient in itself to determine the source of a passage or phrase.

4. *Component Parts.*

The book of Micah falls naturally into three parts, the existence of which has long been recognised. They are chs. 1–3, chs. 4 and 5 and chs. 6 and 7. They are differentiated from each other by their contents, tone and point of view and to some extent by their poetic form (*v. s.*). Chs. 1–3 contain almost exclusively denunciations of sin and proclamations of approaching punishment; chs. 4 and 5 are devoted almost as exclusively to words of hope and cheer; while chs. 5 and 6 combine these two elements. But within these three main divisions the point of view and background change frequently; consequently many scholars have denied the unity of the book. Chs. 1–3, with the exception of $1^{7.\,11}$ and $2^{12.\,13}$ (*q. v.*), constitute the nucleus of the book and furnish a touchstone by which the genuineness of the remaining chapters may be tested. Stade and others have sought to athetize $1^{2\text{-}5a}$, but, as it seems, without sufficient reason; see *in loc.*.

The situation with reference to chs. 4–7 is quite different. The general condition here may be suggested by the following words from Halévy, an ardent supporter of the unity of the book; his statement is particularly applicable to chs. 4–6: "The book of Micah has reached us in a critical state even worse than that of the books of Hosea and Amos. To say nothing of internal corruptions of words, many verses, and even groups of verses, have been torn from their context and inserted haphazard in passages which have no sort of suitable connection with their subject-matter."* This hypothesis of Halévy's, however, does not solve the problem. A bird's-eye view of the history of the criticism of these chapters will place the difficulty squarely before us. For the sake of clearness and convenience, the two groups, chs. 3–4 and 5–6, will be treated separately.

The criticism of chs. 4–5.—Chs. 4 and 5 were first brought into prominence by Ew. who, on the basis of differences of style between them and chs. 1–3, for a time regarded them as belonging to some prophet contemporary with Micah. Later, however, Ew. returned to the defence of Micah's authorship, urging similarities of form, thought and diction, and especially the fact that the denial of chs. 4 and 5 to Micah (as well as chs. 6 and 7) would remove all the Messianic element from Micah's utterance. Casp. followed with a detailed defence of the unity. In 1871, Oort (*ThT*., V, 501–512) characterised $4^{1-7.\ 11-13}$ as an insertion by some pious reader who considered Micah a false prophet and tried to correct his errors. The ground for this was the fact that with the removal of these verses the connection becomes smooth and the improbability that Micah would have inserted a message of hope in the midst of an unfinished call to repentance and a threat of punishment. To this Kue. replied (*ThT*., VI, 45–66), defending the connection of 4^{1-7}, on the ground that the prophet here transports himself in imagination to the last days, and acknowledging that 4^{11-13} describes existing conditions and cannot therefore stand where it does, notwithstanding that it belongs to Micah. De Goeje (*ThT*., VI, 279–284) then proffered a weak defence of the connection of 4^{11-13}. Kue., in a second article (*ThT*., VI, 285–302), suggested that some of the differences between chs. 1–3 and chs. 4–5 were due to the fact that the former deal with the godless leaders while the latter are addressed to the people as a whole who have some claim to pardon. He also emphasised the mobility and vivacity of Micah's style, to which De Goeje had referred, as exempting him from submission to strict logical requirements. We., also, called attention

---

* *Revue sémitique*, XIII (1905), 2.

(Bleek's *Einl.*, 4th ed., p. 425) to the contradiction between $4^{9.10}$ and 4^{11}.

In 1881 appeared Sta.'s epoch-making article (*ZAW.*, I, 161–172), in which he denied Micah's authorship of chs. 4–5 *in toto*. The following considerations are urged in support of this view. It is improbable that Micah would have weakened the effect of his utterances in chs. 1–3 by introducing a message of directly opposite import in chs. 4–5. The content of this section departs widely from the ideas of Isaiah, while chs. 1–3 show close affinity to them; chs. 4–5 are, indeed, in full accord with Joel, Deutero-Isaiah and Zechariah, chs. 12–14. The section is full of postexilic conditions; *e. g.*, $4^{8.10}$ presupposes the Exile as having occurred; 5^{1-3} gives an indefinite, apocalyptic vision of the Messianic age, while pre-exilic ideas of the Messiah spring immediately out of the existing historical situation. The inconsistency and lack of connection within the chapters point to composite origin; *e. g.*, 4^{11}–5^{3} is wholly inconsistent with 4^{8-10}, but it connects well with 4^{1-4} and is continued in 5^{6-14}. These three passages constitute the contribution of a later writer who desired to brighten the dark picture left by Micah; into this addition a later writer, thinking it to be a part of Micah's prophecy, inserted 4^{5-10} $5^{4.5}$ in order to harmonise it with the actual course of events and with the development of prophecy.

Sta.'s discussion has greatly influenced all later scholarship. Giesebrecht (*ThLZ.*, 1881, p. 443) followed him in rejecting ch. 4, but held to the genuineness of ch. 5 on the ground that without it Micah's prophecy would be too one-sided. W. R. Smith, in 1882 (*Proph.*, 2d ed., pp. 430 *f.*), followed Oort in rejecting 4^{11-13}, but refused to go further. In 1883, Sta. (*ZAW.*, III, 1–16) gave further arguments in support of his view, *e. g.*, that Bethlehem and Ephratha (5^{1}) are never identified except in postexilic literature. Cor., in 1884 (*ZAW.*, IV., 89), was the first to place himself unreservedly on Sta.'s side. Now., in the same year (*ZAW.*, IV, 277–290), yielded $4^{5-8.\ 11-13}$ to the interpolator, but rejected Sta.'s claim that chs. 4–5 as a whole were inconsistent with pre-exilic prophecy, citing Is. 18^{7} 19^{19} $11^{10\,ff.}$ as parallels to the description of the coming of "many peoples" to Jerusalem, and Is. $11^{4\,ff.}$ $9^{5.6}$ as parallels to the picture of idyllic peace in 4^{1-4}. As parallel to the fact that these chapters oppose *maṣṣeboth* and *asherim*, to which Isaiah made no objection, Now. cites 3^{12} and the well-known attitude of Isaiah toward Jerusalem. Wildeboer, in 1884 (*De Profeet Micha;* so also in *Letterkunde des Ouden Verbonds*, 3d ed., 1903, 145 *f.*), grants that Sta.'s objections might apply to the *spoken* word, but declares them inapplicable to the *written* word. Che., in his commentary (1885), rejects 4^{5-10} $5^{5.6}$ on grounds of logic. Ry. discussed these chapters fully in his commentary (1887), gathering up and reinforcing the arguments of his predecessors in favour of unity. He explained the difficulties of the section as due to a redactor who arranged scattered utterances of Micah in an order of his own which is to us no order at all. He also urged the general considerations that our knowledge of Hebrew history is too defective to enable us to determine whether a given thought was or was not possible at a certain time, and that the mere fact that a thought is much emphasised in some particular period does not preclude the possibility of its having been uttered previously. In 1889, Pont (*Theol. Studiën*, VII, 439–453) reaffirmed the unity, reiterating the old arguments. In the same year, Kue. again (*Einl.*, II, 360–3) expressed himself upon these chapters, declaring it improbable that 3^{12} was Micah's last word. Hence the authenticity of the following promises was probable. But inconsistencies, the lack of logical sequence and the presence of undoubtedly pre-exilic utterances alongside of others presupposing Judah's captivity made it probable that $4^{6-8.\ 11-13}$ were postexilic, while 5^{9-14} had undergone a thorough working over at a late day.

In 1891, Elh. put forth an ingenious but fanciful theory in defence of the unity of the entire book. In accordance with this, chs. 4–5 should follow chs. 6–7 and should be rearranged thus: 4^{1-8} 5^{1-7} 4^{9-14} 5^{8-14}. However, even thus, 4^{6} is treated as a gloss and 4^{9-14} 5^{8} as postexilic additions. We., in his commentary (1892; 3d ed., 1898), finds possible remnants of genuine utterances of Micah in $4^{9.\ 10.\ 14}$ 5^{9-13}. He emphasises the use of שארית (4^{7}) as a technical eschatological term, the mutually exclusive conceptions of $4^{9.\ 10}$ and 4^{11-13}, and the allusion in 5^{2} to Is. 7^{14} which has apparently become a classic. In 1893, Kosters (*ThT.*, XXVII, 249–274) aligned himself with Sta., making the two chapters postexilic. He regarded 5^{1-8} as the continuation of 4^{6-8}. He suggested also that the present book of Micah was a result of two independent recensions of the original. The one consisted of chs. 1–3 + chs. 4–5; the other contained chs. 1–3 + 6–7; later these two were combined. In the same year, We. (*Kleine Propheten*, 2d ed.) surrendered all but $4^{9.\ 10.\ 14}$ 5^{9-13}. In 1896, GASm. rejected only $5^{3b.\ 7-9}$ as inconsistent with Micah's times. In 1897, Volz (*Die vorexilische Jahweprophetie*, 63–67), following We., granted to Micah $4^{9-10a.\ 14}$ 5^{9-14}, and 5^{4-5} as a badly distorted fragment. $2^{12\,f.}$ $4^{6\,f.\ 10b.\ 13}$ 5^{6-8} are assigned to a later editor, while 4^{8} $5^{1.\ 3.\ 4a}$ belong to another hand and are probably later than 4^{1-4}, which may be from the time of Deutero-Isaiah. Now.'s commentary (1897; 2d ed., 1903) agrees with We. and Volz and adds little. Dr., in his well-known *Introduction*, with characteristic caution declines to commit himself to an opinion on this question. Che. (*EB.*, art. *Micah; cf.* in Introd. to WRS., *Proph.*, 2d ed.) follows Sta., Cor. and Kosters in assigning these chapters to a postexilic date. Marti's commentary (1904) arrives at the same result, but assigns the chapters to a larger number of sources than any of its predecessors had employed. Bu. (*Gesch.*, 1906, p. 89) and Du. (*Zwölf Propheten*, 1910) also agree with Sta.

Reference may be made to the following commentary for detailed statements of the position assumed here with reference to chs. 4–5. It suffices to say in this connection that the arguments of Stade against Micah's authorship seem irrefutable, except possibly in the case of 4^{14} 5^{9-12}. Nothing short of a complete reversal of current views concerning Hebrew eschatology, such as that proposed by Gressmann,[*] could make these chapters intelligible for the age of Micah. Furthermore, as the foregoing history of criticism shows, it is impossible to regard the chapters as a unit in themselves; the attitude toward the heathen world, *e. g.*, is wholly different in $4^{12.\ 13}$ from that in 4^{1-4}, nor is the view of the Messianic age in $5^{4.\ 5}$ consistent with that in 5^{1-3}. But Stade's division of the material between two sources cannot stand. Glosses are represented by $4^{4.\ 5}$ $5^{2.\ 13.\ 14}$; 4^{1-4} stands alone; 4^{11-13} and 5^{6-8} reflect the same background and breathe the same spirit; the remaining sections have no close affinity with any of the preceding or with one another. The chapters thus seem to contain a miscellaneous collection of fragments gathered up from various sources, and having little in common other than a hopeful outlook for the future.

Criticism of chs. 6–7.—The story of the critical study of chs. 6–7 also begins with Ew. (1867). His argument in brief was: (1) chs. 1–5 are so complete in themselves that nothing additional is needed. (2) The style is quite different; there is nothing of the elevated force still met with in chs. 1–5; the tone is more like that of Jeremiah; and the peculiarities of language characteristic of chs. 1–5 are lacking here. (3) The artistic form is quite different; this section has a purely dramatic plan and execution; it is not the utterance of a speaker but that of an artist. "The entire piece proceeds amid changing voices; and there are not fewer than ten voices that are heard one after the other. But since the prophet still retains the ancient artistic form of the str., the whole falls into five strs., which are also five acts, thus completing all that has to be said and giving it a perfectly rounded form." (Ew.'s strs. or "acts" are 6^{1-8} 6^{9-16} 7^{1-6} 7^{7-13} 7^{14-20}). (4) The historical background is wholly different. There is no trace of the stirring and elevated times of Isaiah's activity. The nation seems to be very small and faint-hearted ($6^{6\ f.}$ $7^{11\ f.}$); the selfishness and faithlessness of individuals is greater ($6^{10\ f.}$ 7^{1-6}); the idolatrous tendencies encouraged by Manasseh had long prevailed (6^{16}); and the more religious hardly ventured to name the king openly. The reign of Manasseh best complies with these conditions.

---

[*] *Der Ursprung d. israel.-jüd. Eschatologie* (1905).

The next important contribution to the discussion was made by We. (Bleek's *Einl.*, 4th ed., 1878, pp. 425 *f.*). He follows Ew. in assigning 6[1]–7[6] to the reign of Manasseh, but concludes that 7[7-20] was added during the Exile. He summarises his argument as follows: "Thus the situation in 7[7-20] is quite different from that in 7[1-6]. What was present there, viz., moral disorder and confusion in the existing Jewish state, is here past; what is there future, viz., the retribution of v. [4b], has here come to pass and has been continuing for some time. What in vv. [1-6] was still unthought of, viz., the consolation of the people, tempted in their trouble to mistrust Yahweh, is in vv. [7-20] the main theme. Between v. [6] and v. [7] there yawns a century. On the other hand, there prevails a remarkable similarity between vv. [7-20] and Isaiah, chs. 40–66." (Quoted from Dr.$^{\text{Intr.}}$, p. 333.) Ew.'s view, as modified by We., has been accepted fully, or with but slight variations, by Sta. (*ZAW.*, I, 1881, 161 *f.*), WRS. (*Enc. Brit.*, art. *Micah*), Che., Kue. (*Einl.*, II, 363 *f.*), Cor. (*Einl.*, 1891, 183–6), Pont (*Theol. Studiën*, 1892, p. 340.), Kö. (*Einl.*, 1893, pp. 329 *f.*), Dr. (*Intr.*, pp. 333 *f.*) and Du. (*Zwölf Propheten*, 1910). Cor., however, for a time maintained the authenticity of these chapters (*ZAW.*, IV, 1884, 89 *f.*; so also Kirk., *Doctrine of the Prophets*, 1892, pp. 229 *f.*; and van H., 1908), urging (1) that everything which may be brought forward in support of their origin in Manasseh's day applies equally well to the time of Ahaz (2 K. 16[3]; *cf.* Mi. 6[7]). (2) That the origin of the book would be inexplicable if Micah's work ceased with ch. 3, for chs. 4–5 are enough to offset the gloomy tone of chs. 1–3—why then should there be added a section from the time of Manasseh having no inner connection with chs. 4–5? On the hypothesis of the late origin of chs. 6–7, they should immediately follow chs. 1–3, since they give reasons for the drastic punishment there threatened. (3) That 6[1]–7[6] shows traces of the author of chs. 1–3, having perfect parallels in them (*e. g.*, 1[9. 13] = 6[16]) as well as in the addresses of Isaiah from the reign of Ahaz. (4) That a late working over of 7[7-20] must be granted.

Now. at once replied (*ZAW.*, IV, 288 *ff.*) to Cor. (1) that chs. 6–7 contain no thought not expressed in chs. 1–3 which could serve as a reason for the threat in 3[12]; reasons enough are stated in chs. 1–3; anything further would be superfluous; (2) that ch. 6 cannot be regarded as a continuation of 3[12] since the representation in 6[1 ff.] is wholly different from that in 1[2 ff.] and scarcely consistent with it; (3) that the judgment in 3[12] comes because of the sins of the leaders, priests and prophets, whereas in 6–7 the charge is quite general (7[2]) and against no special classes; (4) that if chs. 6–7 come from the time of Ahaz, as Cor. declares, they can hardly state the grounds for the judgment in chs. 1–3, uttered in the time of Hezekiah (Je. 26[18]); (5) that the prophet who so sharply antagonises the wicked leaders in the time of the comparatively good king, Hezekiah, would not be likely to let them pass almost unnoticed in the reign of Ahaz, an exceedingly wicked king; (6) that "my people" is the object of the prophet's compassion in chs. 1–3, but in chs. 6–7 it is the object of his wrath.

Wildeboer, in 1884 (*De Profeet Micha*, p. 57), adheres to Micah's authorship, stating (1) that differences in artistic structure and manner of presentation do not necessarily involve different authorship; (2) that as there was human sacrifice under Ahaz and also under Manasseh, it is quite probable that there were some who practised it, at least in secret, in the time of Hezekiah; (3) that in 7^{3} the words "prince," "judge," "great one" are used collectively and thus disprove the charge that the leaders are not denounced in these chapters. In 1887, Ry. defended the authenticity of this material on the following grounds. The chapters were written in the beginning of Hezekiah's reign when conditions were essentially the same as under Ahaz. The religious formalism alluded to in $6^{6.\,7.\,10\text{-}12}$ is wholly out of keeping with the reign of Manasseh. $7^{1\text{-}6}$ is an independent section and the immorality there described was possible in Hezekiah's day; but if it must be interpreted literally, it is intelligible neither as coming from Hezekiah's reign nor from that of Manasseh. The hope of return from Assyria and Egypt is indicative of pre-exilic origin; in Deutero-Isaiah the place of exile is always Babylon and Chaldæa. But if the chapters must be assigned to Manasseh's reign, it is still reasonable to assign them to Micah, who may have been still living.

In 1887 also, Sta. (*Geschichte d. Volkes Israel*, I, 634), expressed his conviction of the postexilic origin of ch. 6. In 1890, Gie. (*Beiträge zur Jesaiakritik*, 216 *f.*) declared himself with Ew. as to 6^{1}–7^{6}, but assigned $7^{7\text{-}20}$ to postexilic times. Elh. (1891), on the other hand, endorses the arguments of Cor. and Ry. in behalf of authenticity and attempts to ease all difficulties of connection by placing chs. 6–7 immediately after chs. 1–3 and by rearranging the text in this order: $6^{1\text{-}5}$ $7^{1\text{-}6}$ $6^{6\text{-}16}$ 7^{13} $7^{7\text{-}12}$ $7^{14\text{-}20}$. In 1892, We. again puts himself on record (*Kleine Proph.*, 2d ed.), still maintaining the possibility of Micah's authorship, even in the age of Manasseh, for $6^{1\text{-}8}$, declaring $6^{9\text{-}16}$ independent of its context and without indications of definite date, assigning $7^{1\text{-}6}$ to the period of Malachi, and following Gie. with reference to $7^{7\text{-}20}$. In 1893, Kosters, in connection with a searching review of Elh.'s commentary (*ThT.*, XXVII, 249–274), suggested the postexilic origin of these chapters, citing many words and phrases as characteristic of postexilic language and thought. These chapters were written to explain the fall of Jerusalem as due to the corruption of the generation contemporary with that disaster, it being no longer believed that the children are punished for the sins of the father. The position of GASm. (1896) is near to that of We., for he holds to Micah's authorship of $6^{1\text{-}8}$, is undecided as to $6^{9\text{-}16}$ and $7^{1\text{-}6}$ and regards

7^{7-20} as a psalm composed of fragments from various dates, of which 7^{14-17} points to the eighth century B.C. by its geographical references, and 7^{11} to the period between the fall of Jerusalem and its rebuilding.

Now., in his commentary (1897; 2d ed., 1905), considers the reign of Manasseh a possible date for 6^{1}–7^{6}, but denies Micah's authorship even were he then alive. He would locate 7^{7-20} in the period between the decree of Cyrus and the journey of Nehemiah to Jerusalem. Dr.$^{\text{Intr.}}$ is inclined to agree with Ew. and to deny the necessity of separating 7^{7-20} and assigning it to a later age. Che. (*EB.*, art. *Micah*), makes both chapters postexilic and finds them concerned with the ubiquitous Jerahmeelites. Sta. gives a long list (*ZAW.*, XXIII, 1903, 164–171), of postexilic parallels to 7^{7-20} and assigns the whole of 6–7 to the postexilic age (in *Bibl. Theol. d. Alt. Test.*, 1905, p. 230).

Marti (1904) calls chs. 6–7 "a conglomerate, held together by the conviction that deliverance must finally come, though the sins of the present demand the continuance of God's wrath." Of this conglomerate 6^{1-5} is editorial expansion; 6^{6-8} belongs probably to the fifth century, possibly to the sixth; and ch. 7 to the second century B.C. Bu. also resolves the two chapters into fragments and places them all in the postexilic age (*Gesch.*, 1906). The last commentator, van H. (1908), insists upon the unity of the chapters and upon Micah's authorship, basing it all upon the hypothesis that the two chapters are concerned with Samaria, not Jerusalem, and finding it necessary to transpose 7^{11b-13} to follow 7^{6} (see *ad loc.*).

Hpt. (1910) allows Micah only 33½ lines of text in chs. 1–3. Chs. 4–7 are assigned to the Maccabaean period (170–100 B.C.), while 1^{2-7} is a poem written in celebration of the destruction of Samaria by John Hyrcanus in 107 B.C. This represents a step beyond the conclusions of the foregoing critics, in that Hpt. leaves Micah less than any previous scholar and is confident in his assignment of the non-Micah material to the Maccabaean period and even to the specific years to which the several poems belong. Unfortunately, this confidence cannot be shared by scholars at large until more definite and convincing considerations are forthcoming.

The conclusions arrived at in the following commentary may be briefly summarised. There is no logical unity within chs. 6 and 7; they resolve themselves into seven sections, no one of which connects closely with either its preceding or its following sections. The possibility of Micah's authorship remains open for 6^{9-16} and 7^{1-6}, but is wholly excluded for the remainder. These two sections, together with 6^{1-5}, might be placed in any period of Hebrew history subsequent to the appearance of the great prophets. 6^{6-8} seems to reflect the wisdom of the sages and to belong in the earlier half of the postexilic age. 7^{7-10} and 7^{14-20} come apparently both out of the same conditions; Israel is suffering but hoping, looking back with longing upon the good old days and praying for vengeance; they are best located in the later postexilic period, after the work of Nehemiah and Ezra. 7^{11-13}, however, is wholly detached from its context and is to be explained as coming from the period after the fall of Jerusalem, but before the rebuilding of the city walls. The two chapters thus seem to be a collection of miscellaneous fragments, coming from widely scattered periods and from at least four different authors.

5. *The Formation of the Book of Micah.*

Various attempts have been made to trace the growth of the book of Micah, starting from chs. 1–3, its original nucleus. The views of Kosters and Elhorst have been already mentioned. Marti considers 4^{1-4} and 6^{6-8}, joined together by 4^{5}, the first addition to chs. 1–3; since they reveal the closest sympathy with the ethical tone of Micah. This constituted the book as it existed in the fifth century B.C. Somewhere between this period and the second century B.C., by various unknown stages, 4^{6}–5^{14} and 6^{9}–7^{6} were incorporated. Finally, in order that the prophecy might not end with denunciation, the Maccabaean psalms in 7^{7-20} were added. Cornill (*Einl.*) follows Kosters in part, making 6^{1}–7^{6} the first addition to chs. 1–3. This combined product underwent two revisions, first receiving as insertions $4^{1-4.\ 11-14}$ $5^{1-3.\ 6-14}$, and being completed by the addition of $2^{12.\ 13}$ 4^{5-10} $5^{4.\ 5}$ 7^{7-20}, from the hand of the final redactor. Sievers, however, finds the growth of the book connected with the length of the various poems which constitute it. In chs. 4–7, as rearranged by Sievers, it happens that the longest poem comes first in each chapter, and the succeeding ones are added in the order of their length. It is quite evident that all attempts of this sort are futile, and that in the absence of any definite data it is impossible to secure general acceptance of any scheme, however ingenious. This portion of the history of the book is lost beyond recovery.

§ 2. THE PROPHET MICAH.

1. *His Name.*

Little is known of the man Micah. Our sources of information regarding him are very limited, being confined to chs. 1–3 and Je. 26[18]. The name Micah was doubtless common among the Hebrews; more than a dozen individuals bear it, in one form or another, in the Old Testament. The possession of this name, meaning "*Who is like Yahweh?*", is no indication of any unusual degree of religious fervour on the part of the prophet's parents or family; names containing the name of a deity are very common in all Semitic literature, and in the Old Testament are not infrequently borne by individuals whose parents were not noted for religious zeal; *e. g.*, the children of Ahab and Ahaz, to-wit, Hezekiah. No allusion to his family is made in the superscription or elsewhere, a fact which may argue for his humble origin as a man of the people, like Amos; or may merely be another indication of the self-effacing character of the prophets. Concerning the lineage of no less than six of the prophets nothing is recorded.

2. *His Home.*

The appellation "Morashtite" (1[1] Je. 26[18]) is applied to Micah to distinguish him from the many other bearers of his name; and particularly from his predecessor, Micaiah ben Imlah, with whom he is confused in 1 K. 22[28], where a phrase from his book is ascribed to the earlier Micaiah. This descriptive term apparently identifies his home with Moresheth-Gath (1[14]). This name implies a location in the low hills bordering upon Philistine territory. The list of towns in 1[10 ff.] over which the prophet pours out his grief seems to have been selected from the same region and so to confirm this location of Moresheth. Furthermore, in the *Onomasticon* and in Jerome's preface to Micah, Moresheth is declared to be a small village to the east of Eleutheropolis, the modern Beit-Jibrin.

Locatio

> This region and its significance in the training of our prophet are thus beautifully described by GASm.: "It is the opposite exposure from the wilderness of Tekoa, some seventeen miles away across the watershed. As the home of Amos is bare and desert, so the home of Micah is fair and fertile. The irregular chalk hills are separated by broad glens, in which the soil is alluvial and red, with room for cornfields on either side of the perennial or almost perennial streams. The olive groves on the braes are finer than either those of the plain below or of the Judean table-land above. There is herbage for cattle. Bees murmur everywhere, larks are singing, and although to-day you may wander in the maze of the hills for hours without meeting a man or seeing a house, you are never out of sight of the traces of ancient habitation, and seldom beyond sound of the human voice—shepherds and ploughmen calling to their flocks and to each other across the glens. There are none of the conditions or the occasions of a large town. But, like the south of England, the country is one of villages and homesteads breeding good yeomen—men satisfied and in love with their soil, yet borderers with a far outlook and a keen vigilance and sensibility. The Shephelah is sufficiently detached from the capital and body of the land to beget in her sons an independence of mind and feeling, but so much upon the edge of the open world as to endue them at the same time with that sense of the responsibilities of warfare, which the national statesmen, aloof and at ease in Zion, could not possibly have shared."

3. *His Character.*

A man of the countryside, like Amos, Micah was gifted with clearness of vision and time for thought. The simplicity and seclusion of his rustic life were conducive to "plain living and high thinking." He was not misled by false standards of value to place too high an estimate upon those things which perish with the using. He had Amos's passion for justice and Hosea's heart of love. Knowing his fellow-countrymen intimately, and sympathising profoundly with their sufferings and wrongs, his spirit burned with indignation as he beheld the injustice and tyranny of their rich oppressors. He was pre-eminently the prophet of the poor. He was absolutely fearless as their champion. He would denounce wickedness in high places even though it cost him his life. The fearlessness and force of his character and message deeply impressed his contemporaries, so that even a century later his example was cited as establishing a precedent for Jeremiah's freedom of speech

(Je. 26[18]). A man of this type must necessarily go his own way; he cannot slavishly follow where others lead. Breaking away from the prophets of the day who promise only blessings from Yahweh, he dares to "declare to Jacob his transgression and to Israel his sin," and to point out the inevitable connection between sin and punishment. To the citizens of Jerusalem, proud of their capital and blindly confident of Yahweh's protection, he unflinchingly announces the overthrow of their city. Completely dominated by a vivid consciousness of God and a fervid devotion to the highest interests of his country, he goes forth to his task unshrinking and invincible. To this man of keen perception and sensitive soul, the voice of duty was the voice of God. As with Amos and Hosea, neither angel nor vision was necessary to arouse in him the prophetic spirit; he found his divine call in the cry of human need.

Call – of human need –

§ 3. THE TIMES OF MICAH.

1. *The Date of His Prophecies.*

The superscription of the book places Micah "in the days of Jotham, Ahaz and Hezekiah." This would make him a younger contemporary of both Hosea and Isaiah. But there is good reason to believe that the superscriptions of all three of these books, in their present form at least, are due to the hand of an editor. The superscription of Micah is supported in part by Je. 26[18], which declares, "Micah the Morashtite was prophesying in the days of Hezekiah, king of Judah." This agrees admirably with the content of some of his utterances, *e. g.*, 1[10-16] which seems to sketch the course of Sennacherib's army. But the question arises whether or not Micah prophesied in the reigns of Jotham and Ahaz. His total silence concerning the Syro-Ephraimitish war, the appeal of Ahaz to Assyria and the subsequent deportation of the inhabitants of "all the land of Naphtali" to Assyria (2 K. 15[29]), makes it improbable that he prophesied contemporaneously with these events of such momentous interest to both kingdoms. This confines his prophetic activity to the period following 734 B.C., *i. e.*, the reigns of Ahaz and Hezekiah. His first prophecy (1^{2-9}) concerns itself with the approaching destruction of Samaria, with which is coupled imminent danger to Jerusalem. There is no evidence in either Assyrian or biblical records that Jerusalem and Judah were jeopardised in 721 B.C., when Sargon overthrew Samaria. Nor does Isaiah seem to have anticipated any immediate danger to Judah in connection with that event. Indeed, Judah was at that time paying its regular tribute* to Assyria and hence safe from harm. But the mention of Samaria as still standing and doomed to destruction does not confine us to the period prior to 721 for the date of this first prophecy. As a matter of fact the kind of destruction threatened by the prophet in 1^6 was not experienced in 721 by Samaria. Neither the biblical (2 K. 17^6) nor the Assyrian records speak of any destruction of the city (Sargon's *Annals*, ll. 11 *ff.*). Indeed, the latter distinctly says, "the city I restored and more than before I caused it to be inhabited." But Sargon's kindness was but poorly repaid, for in 720 B.C. Samaria joined a coalition of Syrian states, viz., Hamath, Arpad, Ṣimirra and Damascus in one more effort to shake off the yoke of Assyria.† In 715, Sargon settled Arabian tribes in Samaria;‡ the process of repopulating and thereby thoroughly subduing Samaria was continued by Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal, according to Ezra $4^{2.\,9.\,10}$. An Assyrian governor was resident in Samaria as late as 645 B.C.§ It is, therefore, probable that Micah's prophecy was spoken after 721 B.C. and in the light of the rebellious attitude of Samaria up to and after that date. The specific occasion of the discourse may have been the conspiracy that called Sargon to Ashdod in 713–711 B.C., or perhaps better, that which resulted in the campaign of Sennacherib, 704–701 B.C. It is more than probable, in view of the previous history of Samaria, that she was involved in both attempts to throw off the yoke of Assyria. In either case, the prophet is talking of a destruction of Samaria that is in the future, which he sees to be a prelude to the overthrow of Jerusalem. This is more in consonance with the language of $1^{2\text{ ff.}}$ than the view that the prophet looks back upon the events of 721 B.C. and makes passing allusion to them in order to give weight to his denunciation of Jerusalem.* The whole of the genuine material in chs. 1–3 belongs to one period and that of short duration; it may have been the product of a few weeks or months at a time of great crisis, such as that of Sennacherib's invasion.

---

* This is practically certain in view of the fact that Ahaz paid tribute in 734 B.C., while Sargon (*Prism-Fragment*, ll. 29 *ff.*) enumerates Judah with Philistia, Edom and Moab as peoples under obligation to pay tribute who united with Ashdod in revolt in 713. The reference in Sargon's *Nimrud-Inscr.*, l. 8, to his subjection of Ja-u-du is best explained of the northern Ja'udi, rather than of Judah, since the statement is made in immediate connection with an account of the overthrow of Hamath and other regions in northern Syria. Were the reference to Judah, it must have been in connection with the revolt of Hanno of Gaza in 720, for the *Nimrud-Inscr.* belongs to the year 717 B.C. and Sargon was engaged in other parts of his empire from 719–717. But it is difficult to see why Judah only should have been selected for mention, when Gaza was also involved in the revolt and evidently played a more prominent part. *Cf.* *KAT.*^{3}, pp. 67 *f.*, 271.

† Sargon's *Annals*, l. 25, and K. 1349, ll. 17 *ff.*; see *AOF.*, I, 403, and *KAT.*^{3}, 66.

‡ *Annals*, ll. 95 *ff.*

§ C. H. W. Johns, *Assyrian Deeds and Documents*, II, 137; III, 108.

2. *The Background of Chs.* 1–3.

The situation in Judah in the period from 715 to 701 B.C. was one of absorbing interest. The air was full of plots and counterplots. Syria was the bone of contention between Assyria and Egypt, the rivals for world-dominion. Assyria was in possession; Syria was restless under her heavy yoke; Egypt was alert to foment dissatisfaction and aid in freeing Syria from her burden, hoping thereby to supplant Assyria. Jerusalem was naturally a hotbed of intrigue. Political feeling ran high. A pro-Assyrian and a pro-Egyptian party fought for pre-eminence in the councils of the weak king, Hezekiah. Success attended the adherents of Egypt, and revolt against Assyria was organised in 713 and again in 705 B.C. But the result on both occasions was but to weld the bonds of Assyria more tightly upon Judah. Isaiah, resident in Jerusalem and probably related to the leading families, was deeply concerned in all this political turmoil and an active participant in much that was going on at court. *Cf. e. g.*, Is. $20^{1\text{ ff.}}$ $18^{1\text{ ff.}}$ $30^{1\text{ ff.}}$ $31^{1\text{ ff.}}$ $10^{5\text{ ff.}}$. Micah, however much he may have been stirred by these events, eschews politics in his public utterance, and confines himself to distinctively religious and ethical considerations.

Micah portrays a social and economic situation in Judah very similar to that of Samaria as described by Amos in the years immediately preceding the overthrow of the northern kingdom. *Cf.* H.^{AH}, p. ciii.

---

* So *e. g.*, We., and Smend, *Rel.*^{2}, 237 *f.*

> There is the same luxury and indulgence engendered by the possession of great riches. The plunder carried away by Sennacherib after the siege of Jerusalem in 701 B.C. is tabulated by him as follows (Taylor-Cylinder, col. 3, ll. 34–40): "Thirty talents of gold, eight hundred talents of silver, precious stones, . . . large lapis lazuli, couches of ivory, thrones of elephant skin and ivory, ivory, ushu and urkarinu woods of every kind, and his daughters, his palace-women, male and female singers, to Nineveh, my royal city, I caused to be brought after me."

A degenerate aristocracy, mastered by greed and fattening upon tyranny, makes life unbearable for the tiller of the soil and the wage-earner. The possession of wealth is looked upon as the *summum bonum;* nothing may stand in the way of its attainment. The ordinary demands of justice and righteousness are trampled underfoot. The quality of mercy is swallowed up in avarice. The custodians and administrators of law abuse their powers. Justice is for sale to the highest bidder (3^{11}). Under due process of law widows and orphans are expelled from their ancestral homes, that a few acres may be added to the estate of the neighbouring landlord ($2^{2.\,9}$). In the lust for wealth, the substance and sustenance of the poor are devoured, so that they are reduced to the lowest depths of misery and degradation (3^{1-3}). Even the sacraments and consolations of religion are on the market; priests and prophets cater to the rich and browbeat the poor ($3^{5\,\text{ff.}\,11}$). Similar conditions are exposed in contemporary utterances of Isaiah (*e. g.*, $1^{16\,\text{f.}}$ $28^{7\,\text{f.}}$ $29^{20\,\text{f.}}$).

Making all necessary allowances for the prophetic point of view, it still remains true that affairs in Judah were on the down grade. Intimate contact with Assyrian and Egyptian civilisations in commerce and politics had brought in new standards of living and changed ideals. Secularisation of life was making rapid progress. Commercial ideals were supplanting those of ethical and spiritual origin. Appearances were becoming more important than realities. Character was of less repute than power. The fatal vacillation which led Judah into a practical distrust of Yahweh and made her fate the shuttlecock of conflicting political parties was also sapping the moral strength of the nation. Loyalty to the old Hebrew ideals which had obtained in dealings between man and man was crumbling rapidly away before the desire to ape the splendour of foreign courts and live the life of sensuous ease. At such a time there was dire need of the prophetic cry calling men back to God and duty.

§ 4. THE MESSAGE OF MICAH.

The prophet Micah marks no great epoch in the history of prophecy. He is not the apostle of any new teaching; he does but reiterate the great truths proclaimed by his predecessors. But he is no mere imitator; he has forged his message in the passion of his own soul, and stamped upon it the impress of his own personality. Working amid conditions similar to those which confronted Amos, his message is necessarily also similar. But the preaching of Amos lacks the personal touch so distinctly felt in that of Micah, whose message quivers with feeling. Micah knows by experience whereof he speaks; he has been a victim of the circumstances against which he protests. Himself a peasant, he becomes the spokesman of peasants.

Micah's task was to open the eyes of the blind and to unstop the ears of the deaf. But none are so blind as those that will not see. In spite of the preaching of Amos and Hosea, Israel persisted in cherishing an illusion. The key to the situation is furnished by Mi. 3^{11}. A wrong conception of God held sway over the minds of the people. "Yahweh is in the midst of us; therefore disaster cannot befall us." This was to look upon the relation of Yahweh to his people as necessary, and not voluntary on his part. It was to conceive of that relation, moreover, as unconditioned by any high demands. There was no essential difference between this conception of God and that common to the nations surrounding Israel. The language of 3^{11} is, of course, not to be taken as literally exact. Israel had experienced too many chastisements at the hands of Yahweh to suppose that it possessed any guarantee against further afflictions. Yahweh might become angry at his land and vent his wrath upon his people for some real or fancied slight, even

NOTE

as Chemosh executed his anger upon Moab (*Mesha Inscription*, l. 5). But he would not definitely abandon his people to destruction; he could not remain obdurate and insensible to holocausts of oxen and rivers of oil. On his great day, the day of Yahweh, he would repent himself of his anger and manifest himself on behalf of his people in destructive might against their foes and his. *Cf.* Am. 5^{18}. For people so minded, sacrifice and offering were the substance of religion. Let the ritual be exact and gorgeous and the sacrificial gifts numerous and costly and Yahweh could desire little more. *Cf.* Is. $1^{11\,\text{ff.}}$.

Against this whole attitude toward God, the prophets of the eighth century set themselves resolutely. Micah joined with Amos-Hosea and Isaiah in an effort to purify religion by elevating the popular conception of God. This he does by emphasising the true nature of Yahweh's demands upon his people. He seeks justice and mercy, not oxen and sheep. He desires right character rather than right ritual. Herein lies Micah's whole interest; he plays the changes upon this single string. He does not suppose himself to be announcing anything new to the people, nor indeed was he so doing. Israel had long credited Yahweh with ethical interests. But they were given only secondary significance, whereas Micah would make them the supremely important element in the divine character in so far as it concerns men. Divine favour consequently at once ceases to be an affair of purchase at any price, and becomes a matter of striving after the attainment of divine ideals of righteousness and justice.

Micah's message naturally assumes the form of denunciation of sin and threatening of punishment. Yahweh being just and righteous requires the same qualities from his people. But they have not yielded them; hence punishment must be inflicted upon them. The sins are charged primarily against the ruling classes in Jerusalem. They have been guilty of injustice and cruelty toward the poor; they have bought and sold the rights of men; they have violated the moral law as laid down by Yahweh himself. Even the religious leaders have not escaped the general corruption. They have dared to prostitute their high calling for the sake of gain. They make a mockery of religion by allying themselves with the rich and powerful in the oppression of the poor. They whose duty it is to expose sin cast over it the cloak of religion, and wax rich. This attitude on Micah's part toward the prophets of his day reveals the same cleavage in prophecy that had become evident in the days of his predecessor, Micaiah ben Imlah (1 K. 22), is alluded to by Amos (7^{12-15}), placed Jeremiah in peril of his life ($26^{10\text{ ff.}}$) and continued to the last days of prophecy (Zc. 13^{2-6}). Micah, standing almost alone and in an unpopular cause, dared to denounce all the vested interests of his day.

Apparently, Micah entertained no hope of repentance on the part of those whom he upbraided. He sees nothing ahead of them but punishment. Samaria and Jerusalem alike are to be destroyed, and that utterly. The cities are the scene of destruction, being the home of the ruling classes. Micah is the first of the prophets to threaten Jerusalem with total destruction. A pronunciamento of this kind is indisputable evidence of the prophet's initiative and courage. That Yahweh's splendid temple, which had stood as the visible reminder of his presence since the days of Solomon, should pass into the hands of a pagan nation to be desecrated and destroyed was a statement altogether incredible to the citizens of Jerusalem, and one which only absolute and unswerving loyalty to Yahweh and his will could possibly have enabled Micah to make.

Not a word of Micah's is preserved for us concerning hopes for Israel's future. Yet that he should have had no such hopes is psychologically and religiously unintelligible. His conception of Yahweh, even though as Lord of heaven and earth and able to move the nations at his will ($1^{3.\ 4.\ 10-16}$), never for a moment included the possibility of Yahweh transferring his love to another nation. Were Israel as a whole to perish, Yahweh would be left without a representative among the nations of the earth. But while Micah saw the scourge of an invading army prostrate the countryside and destroy the capital, there is no evidence that he looked for the annihilation of the nation as such.* Living apart from the glamour and power of the capital, he did not identify the fate of the nation with that of Jerusalem. He may have given over the corrupt capital to destruction without a moment's hesitation as to Israel's future, believing it lay in the hands of the simple-minded country folk rather than with the degenerate leaders of church, state and society in Jerusalem. Furthermore, Yahweh was great enough to win glory for himself apart from the temple and the capital. He was not shut up to one way of manifesting himself among his people. He in whose presence the mountains quake and dissolve is surely able to vindicate himself in the sight of the world even though Jerusalem fall.

---

* *Cf.* Sm., *Rel.*², 237 *f.*

What the immediate effect of Micah's preaching was we have no means of knowing. True, Je. 26[18. 19] preserves a tradition that Hezekiah's reformation was due to the influence of Micah. But however true that may be, neither the record of Je. 26[18. 19] nor the account of Hezekiah's reform accords closely with the contents of Micah's message as known to us. For Micah seems to have denounced the nobles and councillors of the king rather than the king himself as the face of the narrative in Jeremiah would imply; and his preaching was concerned primarily with social wrongs rather than with idolatry and cultus as in 2 K. 18[4 ff.]. In any case his words were cherished among the people of the land for whom he laboured and his example of sturdy independence and freedom of speech in the name of Yahweh established a precedent that was of good service to Jeremiah, the bearer of a similar message.

§ 5. RECENT LITERATURE ON THE BOOK OF MICAH.

For discussions of the poetical form of Micah, see § 1. Only the more important literature can be mentioned here.

1. *On the Text.*

K. Vollers, *Das Dodekapropheton der Alexandriner*, *ZAW.*, IV (1884), 1–12. V. Ryssel, *Die arabische Uebersetzung des Micha in der Pariser und Londoner Polyglotte*, *ZAW.*, V (1885), 102–38. *Idem.*, *Untersuchungen über die Textgestalt und die Echtheit des Buches Micha. Ein kritischer Kommentar zu Micha*

(1887). M. Sebök, *Die Syrische Uebersetzung der zwölf kleinen Propheten und ihr Verhältniss zu dem Massoretischen Text und zu den älteren Uebersetzungen namentlich den LXX und dem Targum* (1887). Schuurmans Stekhoven, *De Alex. Vertaling van het Dodekapropheton* (1887). H. P. Smith, *The Text of Micah*, in *Hebraica*, IV (1888), 75–81. J. Taylor, *The Massoretic Text and the Ancient Versions of the Book of Micah* (1891). H. Graetz, *Emendationes in plerosque Sacrae Scripturae Veteris Testamenti libros*, etc. (1893). P. Ruben, *Critical Remarks upon Some Passages of the Old Testament* (1896). H. Oort, *Textus Hebraici Emendationes quibus in Vetere Testamento Neerlandice usi sunt A. Kuenen, J. Hooykaas, W. H. Kosters, H. Oort; edidit H. Oort* (1900). W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Old Latin Texts of the Minor Prophets*, in *Journal of Theological Studies*, V (1903), 247–53. *Idem.*, *Codex Taurinensis* (1908). Agnes Smith Lewis, *Codex Climaci Rescriptus* (Horae Semiticae, No. VIII, 1909), pp. 2 and 22 (giving a Palestinian-Syriac Version of Mi. 4^{1-5}). B. Duhm, *Anmerkungen zu den zwölf Propheten*, in *ZAW.*, XXXI (1911), 81–93.

2. *On Introduction.*

All the standard handbooks of Introduction to the Old Testament have sections on Micah. Special attention may be called to Driver (new ed., 1910), König (1893), Kuenen (2d ed., 1885 *f.*), Wildeboer (3d ed., 1903), Cornill (6th ed., 1908; Engl. transl., 1907) and Budde, *Geschichte der Althebräischen Litteratur* (1906). Good summaries are furnished also by the encyclopedia articles, viz., those of Cheyne, in *Encyclopædia Biblica;* Nowack, in Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible;* and Volck, in *Protestantische Realencyklopädie* (3d ed.). To these must be added, by the careful student, Caspari, *Über Micha den Morasthiten und seine prophetische Schrift* (1852). Stade, *Bemerkungen über das Buch Micha*, *ZAW.*, I (1881), 161–72. *Idem.*, *Weitere Bemerkungen zu Micha, IV–V*, *ibid.*, III (1883), 1–16. Nowack, *Bemerkungen über das Buch Micha*, *ibid.*, IV (1884), 277–91. Stade, *Bemerkungen*, on Nowack's article, *ibid.*, IV, 291–97. Ryssel, *op. cit.* (1887). Pont, *Micha-Studiën*, in *Theologische Studiën*, 1888, pp

235–46; 1889, pp. 431–53; 1892, pp. 329–60. Kosters, *De Samenstelling van het boek Micha*, in *ThT.*, 1893, pp. 249–74. Volz, *Die vorexilische Jahweprophetie und der Messias* (1897), 63–67. K. J. Grimm, *Euphemistic Liturgical Appendixes in the Old Testament* (1901), 78–81, 94 *f.*. Stade, in *ZAW.*, XXIII (1903), 163–71, on Mi. 1^{2-4} and 7^{7-20}. See also the literature cited in § 1 of Introduction.

3. *On Interpretation.*

The modern movement in the interpretation of Micah began with Ewald's commentary (1840; 2d ed., 1867). Among later commentators may be mentioned Roorda, *Commentarius in Vaticinium Michae* (1869), a keen textual critic. Reinke, *Der Prophet Micha* (1874). Hitzig-Steiner, *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten* (1881). Cheyne, *Micah, with Notes and Introduction* (1882). Orelli, *The Twelve Minor Prophets* (1888; 3d ed., 1908; Engl. transl., 1893). Elhorst, *De Profetie van Micha* (1891). Wellhausen, *Die kleinen Propheten übersetzt und erklärt* (1892; 3d ed., 1898). G. A. Smith, *The Book of the Twelve Prophets* (1896). Nowack, *Die kleinen Propheten übersetzt und erklärt* (1897; 2d ed. 1904). Marti, *Dodekapropheton erklärt* (1904). Halévy, in *Revue sémitique*, XII and XIII (1904 *f.*). A. van Hoonacker, *Les douze petits prophètes* (1908). Margolis, *Micah* (1908).

Special phases and passages receive consideration in the following: H. Oort, *Het Beth-Efraat van Micha* V : 1, in *ThT.*, V (1871), 501–11. Kuenen, *De Koning uit Beth-Ephrat*, *ibid.*, VI (1872), 45–66. Oort, *Ter verklaring van Micha III–V. Nog iets over Beth-Efraat en Migdal-Eder*, *ibid.*, VI, 273–79. M. J. de Goeje, *Ter verklaring van Micha III–V. Proeve van verklaring van Micha* IV : 1–V : 2, *ibid.*, VI, 279–84. Kuenen, *Ter verklaring van Micha III–IV. Nalezing*, *ibid.*, VI, 285–302. Duhm, *Die Theologie der Propheten* (1875), pp. 178–93. Wildeboer, *De profeet Micha en zijne beteekenis voor het verstand der profetie onder Israel* (1884). W. R. Smith, *The Prophets of Israel and Their Place in History* (2d ed., 1895). Guthe's Translation and Notes in Kautzsch's *Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments* (3d ed., 1909). Kent's Translation and Notes in *Sermons, Epistles* *and Apocalypses of Israel's Prophets* (1910). M. Rahmer, *Die hebräischen Traditionen in den Werken des Hieronymus. Die Commentarii zu den zwölf kleinen Propheten. Heft* 2, *Obadja, Jona, Micha.* (1902).

A COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF MICAH.

A. CHAPTERS 1–3.

§ 1. *The Superscription* (1^1).

This states the authority of the utterance and the author's name and clan, together with the period of his activity and the subject-matter of his writings.

1. *The word of Yahweh*] This term is usually employed for the work of the prophet. *V.* H.^{AH}, 201 *f.*.—*Which came unto*] This use of the verb is common in prophetic utterance: in the superscriptions of Ho., Jo., Jon., Zp., Hg., Zc., Je., and also Hg. $2^{1.\ 10.\ 20}$ Zc. 1^7 4^8 6^{10} $7^{4.\ 8}$ 8^1 Is. 28^{13} 38^4; and exceedingly common in the books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. It is part of a larger usage representing the meaning *come into existence, become*. *Cf.* Gn. 1^3 and Mi. 7^4, where it is parallel to בוא.—*Micah*] Little is known of the life of this prophet, except that he was of rustic origin, preached in the days of Hezekiah and made so profound an impression as to be still remembered in the days of Jeremiah, nearly a century later (Je. 26^{18}).—*The Morashtite*] Of the eight men named Micah, or Micaiah, in the Old Testament, the two leading ones are the Micah of our book and Micaiah ben Imlah (1 K. $22^{4\ \mathrm{ff.}}$), a contemporary of Ahab.* The appellation of *Morashtite*, distinguishing the former and occurring only here and in Je. 26^{18}, is a gentilic adjective derived from the name Moresheth (1^{14}), which in all probability was the prophet's home.—*In the days of Jotham, Ahaz, Hezekiah, kings of Judah*] A later addition,† for the substantial truth of which evidence is furnished by Je. 26^{18}; but no sufficient grounds exist for believing Micah to have prophesied in the days of Jotham.—*Which he perceived*] This emphasises the character

---

* *V.* H.^{AH}, lv, lvi.

† *V. i.*; and Introduction, § 3.

of the prophet's message as a divine revelation.—*Concerning Samaria and Jerusalem*] An accurate summary of the contents of Micah's prophecies, whether the destruction of Samaria spoken of in 1^{5-7} be already past or yet to come.

The superscription seems to be of Judean origin, since no mention is made of the contemporary kings of Israel. But it cannot in its present form be credited to Micah himself, for none of the contents of the book can be assigned to so early a date as the reign of Jotham; the use of חזה in the sense of "utter" or "announce" is a sign of late origin (*cf.* H.^{AH}, 4; Hoffman, *ZAW.*, III, 95); and the latter part of the superscription is similar to the editorial additions in Ho. 1^1, Is. 1^1. The original legend, therefore, was, *The word of Yahweh which came to Micah, the Morashtite* (so We., Now., Marti, Du.; *cf.* Che., in *CB.*).

1. דבר יהוה אשר היה] 𝔊, *and the word of the Lord came* (so Σ,Θ, 𝔄), a free rendering, rather than a different text; Jonah is the only prophetic book beginning ויהי דבר י׳, though isolated oracles are not infrequently so introduced, *e. g.*, Je. 1^4 Ez. 3^{15}. Some codd. of 𝔊 (87, 91, 228 and 𝔖^H) reproduce 𝔐 literally.—מיכה] The interpretation of this name as meaning, *Who is like (this child)?* (Gray, *Hebr. Prop. Names*, 157; *cf.* מִיכָא, 2 S. 9^{12}), is hardly probable, for such a name leaves too much to be supplied by the imagination. It is better taken as a shorter form of מִיכָיָה (so Kt., Je. 26^{18}); *cf.* מִיכָיָהוּ (2 Ch. 17^7) and מִיכָיְהוּ (1 K. 22^8), meaning, *Who is like Yahu?* *Cf.* יהו, the form of the divine name in the Assouan Papyri and the form יו found both as prefix and as affix on the ostraca recently discovered at Samaria. Analogous forms are מִיכָאֵל, and the Assyrian mannu-ki-ilu-rabu = *who is like the great God?* and mannu-ki-Adad = *who is like Adad* (Gray, *Hebr. Prop. Names*, 157; Fried. Delitzsch, *Prol.*, 210). The longer and the shorter forms are used interchangeably in the later literature. *Cf.* 𝔊, Μειχαιαν; Kt. and Qr. in Je. 26^{18} 2 K. 22^{12} and 2 Ch. 34^{20}; and Ju. $17^{1.4}$, wherein a long form appears, while the short form prevails in the rest of chs. 17 and 18; in $17^{1.4}$ 𝔊^B reproduces the long form of 𝔐, 𝔗 has the long form in v. ^{1}, but the short in v. ^{4}, and 𝔊^A 𝔙 𝔖 have the short form in both verses. There is no good reason to suppose that this equivalence does not rest upon sound tradition.—מרשתי] *Cf.* 1^{14}. 𝔊, τὸν τοῦ Μωρασθεί, treating it as a patronymic; in Je. 26^{18} 𝔊 has ὁ Μωραθίτης, several mss. omit the σ from before θ here; this is due to the similar pronunciation of the two letters. 𝔗, מְמָרֵשָׁה; similarly 𝔖, mistakenly connecting it with the Mareshah of 1^{15}.—יותם] 2 mss. of de R. prefix (ו)עזיהו.—יחזקיה] 𝔊 𝔙 𝔖 prefix conj.; hence, and because asyndeton is uncommon in historical prose, Ro. emends to וִחז׳; but *cf.* Is. 1^1 Ho. 1^1, where 𝔊 again inserts καί; the fact that the form יְחז׳ occurs in Chronicles 35 times, while the shorter form is found only 5 times, likewise argues for the full form in this late superscription.—אשר] 𝔊, *ὑπὲρ ὧν*, a rendering made necessary by the literal translation of חזה as *saw*. *Cf.* 𝔗, which renders חזה, *he prophesied.*—שמרון] *V. i.* on vv.$^{4.5}$; on form, *cf.* Assy., *Sa-me-ri-na.*—ירושלם] *V.* H.^{AH}, 47.

§ 2 *The Doom of Israel* (1^{2-9}).

This oracle resolves itself into six strophes of four lines each. (1) The announcement of Yahweh's appearance in judgment (v.^{2}). (2) The convulsions of nature attendant upon his coming (vv.$^{3.4a.b}$). (3) The occasion of this punitive manifestation is the sin of Israel, especially as represented in the capital cities (v.^{5}). (4) Yahweh states that Samaria is to be razed to the ground because of her sins (v.^{6}). (5) Therefore does the prophet break forth into inconsolable lamentation (v.^{8}). (6) For the destruction is irremediable and will extend even to Jerusalem (v.^{9}).

HEAR ye, peoples all;
Hearken, O earth, and her fulness.
Yahweh will become a witness against you,
The Lord from his holy temple.
YEA, see! Yahweh is coming forth from his place;
He will descend upon the heights of the earth;
And the mountains will melt under him,
And the valleys be cloven asunder.
FOR the transgression of Jacob is all this,
And for the sin of the house of Judah.
What is Jacob's transgression? Is it not Samaria?
And what is Judah's sin? Is it not Jerusalem?
THEREFORE will I turn Samaria into a field,
Into a planted vineyard;
And I will pour down her stones into the valley,
And lay bare her foundations.
FOR this, let me lament and wail;
Let me go barefoot and stripped;
Let me make lamentation like the jackals,
And mourning like the daughters of the desert.
FOR her stroke is incurable.
Yea, it comes even to Judah;
It reaches unto the gate of my people,
Even unto Jerusalem.

The measure of this poem is trimeter, with an occasional rise to a tetrameter or a descent to dimeter (in v.^{8}, where the elegiac movement appears in perfect harmony with the contents of the str.). The first three strs. describe the coming of Yahweh and its cause; the last three set forth the nature of the punishment and its effect. This arrangement involves the retention of vv. $^{2-5a}$ as genuine, notwithstanding the objections of Sta., Now., Marti, *et al.*, and the excision of vv. $^{4c.d.7}$ as later accretions. Now. has already felt the difficulty of v. $^{4c.d}$ and attempted to remedy it by interchanging the positions of vv. ^{4b} and ^{4c}. But ^{4a} and ^{4b} belong together; the expansion of a thought by the addition of a comparison is no uncommon thing (*cf.* 7^{10}); and the lines $^{4c.d}$ burden the str.. The argument against v. ^{7} lies in the fact that it breaks the close connection between v. ^{6} and v. ^{8} (the lamentation of v. ^{8} is certainly not on account of the destruction of the idols in v. ^{7}, but because of the fall of the city related in v. ^{6}); its indulgence in detail is likewise quite out of harmony with the swift, powerful strokes employed to sketch the scene of destruction. Moreover, Micah's emphasis was not upon the iniquity of idolatry, but upon that of crimes against the social order. It is not likely, therefore, that he would make idolatry the sole cause of the threatened disaster, as is done if v. ^{7} be retained. The two great cities are here singled out for denunciation; but idolatry was no more rampant in the city than in the country. These facts, together with the marked variation from the strophic norm of the context, in that it constitutes a five-line strophe, make the case against v. ^{7} conclusive (so also Marti, Now.^{K}, Siev., Gu.). Objections against vv. $^{2-5a}$ were first formulated by Sta., *ZAW.*, XXIII, 163. They are (1) that here the judgment is directed against the heathen, with whom Micah has no concern; (2) that the connection of this world-judgment with the impending calamity of Israel is a thought characteristic of later times; (3) that the conception of Yahweh as abiding in the heavens is of late origin; and (4) that in vv. $^{2-4}$ the movement is trimeter, while in vv. $^{5ff.}$ the *Qîna*-rhythm prevails. But it is by no means so certain that the prophetic eschatology took on its universalistic colouring only in later times. The first two chapters of Amos seem to indicate an early connection between Yahweh's judgment of Israel and a more or less widely extended world-catastrophe. *Cf.* also Gressmann, *Der Ursprung d. isr.-jüd. Eschatologie* (1905), 144 *f.*. There was certainly nothing in the eighth-century idea of God that prevented attributing to him activities of world-wide scope. *Cf.* Am. 9^{7} and Gn. 1–11. The belief that Yahweh enthrones himself in the heavens cannot legitimately be made of late origin (*contra* Kau., *DB.*, V, 646) in view of the theophany at Sinai (Ex. 19$^{11.18}$ = J); of the occurrence of the title 'God of the heavens' in the indubitably early passage Gn. 24^{7} (J); of the parallel title עליון in Nu. 24^{16}, an equally early passage; and of the mention of a Phœnician deity, Baal-šamen, in a contract between Esarhaddon (681–668) and the king of Tyre (*v.* *KAT.*^{3}, 357). The change of rhythm in vv. $^{5f.}$ does not necessarily involve a change of authorship (*cf.* Siev., who constructs a separate oracle in Qîna-rhythm of vv.$^{5.\ 6.\ 8}$); similar changes occur elsewhere within a poem, *e. g.*, 2^{3} 4^{10}. Furthermore, the omission of vv.$^{2\text{-}5a}$ leaves the opening of the oracle abrupt and brusque to a degree not paralleled elsewhere in Mi. 1–3.

2. כלם] 𝔊, λόγους = Aram., מִלִּים, a familiar term to the translators; כ and מ were easily confused in the old script. *Cf.* 1^{12} 5$^{11.\ 13}$ 7^{20} 𝔊, Jb. 8^{9} (where כי תמ׳ = מְתֻם׳), Zc. 2^{10} (where 𝔐, כארבע = 𝔊, מֵאַר׳) and Mal. 1^{10} (where 𝔐 מִי = 𝔊 כִּי). The conjecture of Ry. that 𝔊 originally read λόγους πάντας is without any support and is unnecessary. 𝔖 *all of you* (so Du.); but in Jb. 17^{10} 𝔖 makes the same change. 𝔐 is substantiated by 1 K. 22^{28b}, a verbatim quotation of this phrase.—הקשיבי] In codd. Kenn. 30, 96, 224, —בו; in the same codd. and in 4, 101, 145, 150 (*cf.* 𝔊 𝔖 𝔙) וְהִק׳; but both of these variations are due to scribal correction.—ומלאה] 𝔊 freely, *and all who are in it;* 𝔖 *with her fulness.*—אדני יהוה] Om. א׳ with 𝔊^{A} and 𝔄; it is superfluous to the metre, and is either a gloss on יהוה or a dittog. from the following line (so also Marti, Now.^{K}, Siev., Stk., Du..—לעד] 𝔊, εἰς μαρτύριον, abstract for concrete.—**3.** ודרך] Om. with 𝔊, as a dittog. of וירד; this also improves the rhythm; Siev., Hpt. om. וירד instead. Du. om. either.—**4.** ונמסו וגו׳] 𝔊, transposing the vbs., *and shall be shattered the mountains under him and the valleys melted.*—העמקים] Codd. 229 (Kenn.) and 224 (de R.), הגבעות.—**5.** ובחטאות] Rd. וּבְחַטַּאת, with 𝔊 𝔗 (but cod. Reuchl. has pl.) and codd. 211, 1257 (de R.). 26 codd. of Kenn. have defective writing. The sg. is required by the parallel פשע, and by 𝔊's rendering of במות in l. 4 (so Ro., Taylor, We., Pont, Gu., Oort$^{Em.}$, Now., Marti, Stk., Du.).—ישראל] Rd. יְהוּדָה, because of the use of the latter in l. 4 (so Seb., Now., We., Pont, Gu.). A similar interchange of names occurs in Ho. 5$^{12.\ 14}$; according to the Massora such confusion of names was not infrequent (*v.* the citation in Seb. 46, note 3).—מי] Seb. and We., מָה.—במות] Rd. חַטַּאת, with 𝔖 and codd. (Kenn.) 201, 228, on margin (so Houb., Dathe, Bauer, Ro., Oort$^{Em.}$, Marti, Hal., Siev., Stk., Gu., Du.). *Cf.* 𝔊, ἡ ἁμαρτία οἴκου; so 𝔗, 𝔏. For a similar insertion of בית by 𝔊, see many codd. HP., which insert it in v.^{5c} before יעקב. במות is a gloss which succeeded in displacing the original text; it is impossible because the answer *Jerusalem* does not fit; nor was Jerusalem noted for *high-places*, the temple taking their place; the parallelism is against it; the sin of Judah as Micah saw it consisted in oppression, murder, etc., rather than in worshipping on the high-places; and the Vrss. all testify against 𝔐. Kue., חטאת בית (so H. P. Smith, Seb., Taylor, Elh., Pont, Gr., Gu., GASm., Now., We.).—**6.** לעי השדה] Rd. לְשָׂדֶה, omitting עי׳ (so Marti, Siev., Gu.) as a gloss. 𝔊, εἰς ὀπωροφυλάκιον ἀγροῦ; 𝔖, *for a house of the country, the field*, connecting השדה with the following instead of the preceding context. We., ליער הש׳ (*cf.* 3^{12} Ez. 21^{2}; so Now.), or לעיר ה׳ (*cf.* 1 S. 27^{5}). Hi., לְעִיָּה ש׳, connecting שדה with following words (*cf.* 𝔖); but עיה would be ἅπ..—לַגַּי] Rd. לגיא with 6 codd. (Kenn.); א lost through haplo.. 𝕲, εἰς χάος. 𝖁, *quasi acervum lapidum in agro.* Gr. לְלַ ה'.—7. יכּתּוּ] 𝕲, κατακόψουσι, an active form with indefinite subject, equivalent to the passive. *Cf.* French *on*, German *man* (so Ry., *contra* Bauer, Jus., Hi., Vol., who posit a different pointing for 𝕸).—אתנניה] 𝕷, *locationes.* We. אֲשֵׁרֶיהָ (so Oort$^{Em.}$, Marti, Gu.), but this would require a fem. form of the vb. (Hal.). Hal. חַמָּנֶיהָ.—קבצה] Rd., with 𝕾 𝕿 𝖁, קֻבְּצוּ to conform with יכּתּוּ and requirements of grammar (so Dathe, Ew., Taylor, Elh., We., Pont, Gr., GASm., Now., Hal., Marti, Siev., Gu., Du.). *Cf.* 𝕲, συνήγαγεν.—8. 𝕲 places all vbs. in 3d pers. sg., 𝕾 in 2d pers. sg. fem., 𝕿 in 3d pers. pl. masc..—אילכה] Qr. and some codd. of Kenn. אלכה.—שילל] Qr. and 31 codd. (Kenn.) שׁוֹלָל.—אעשה] 𝕲^A, ποιήσεται καὶ ποιήσαιτε.—כתנים] 𝕲, ὡς δρακόντων; so 𝖁. Aq., σειρήνων. Θ, λεόντων. 𝕾, *a jackal.* Cod. 96 (Kenn.) כּתּנין.—בנות יענה] 𝕲, θυγατέρων σειρήνων; so 𝕾.—9. אנושה] 𝕲, κατεκράτησεν; Σ Θ, βιαία; 𝖁, *desperata.*—מכותיה] Rd. מַכָּתָהּ, with 𝕲, ἡ πλήγη αὐτῆς, and in agreement with the sg. of the vbs.; so 𝕾 𝖁 𝕿 and 7 codd. of de R. and 1 cod. of Kenn. (so We., Gr., GASm., Now., Marti, Hal., Siev., Stk., van H., Marg., Gu.). Du. מַכַּת יָהּ.—נגע] Rd. נגעה, with 𝕾 𝕿, in conformity with demands of grammar (so Taylor, We., Now., Marti, Hal., Siev., Stk., van H., Marg., Gu., Du.). Elh. נֻגַּע.—ער־ירושלם] We., Now., Stk., om. as gloss. Marti, עדיך יר'.

Str. I contains the call for attention.—2. *Hear ye, peoples all*] The prophet addresses the nations of the earth,* rather than the tribes of Israel † (although עמים is sometimes used of the tribes; *cf.* Gn. 49^{10} Dt. 32^{8} 33^{3} Zc. 11^{10} Ho. 10^{14}), as appears from the parallel expression, *O earth and her fulness*] which always designates the world as a whole and never any special portion. *Cf.* Dt. 33^{16} Ps. 24^{1}. The nations are summoned not as witnesses (*cf.* Am. 3^{9} Dt. 4^{26} 30^{19} Is. 1^{2}), but as vitally interested auditors whom it behooves to consider diligently what they hear, for Israel's case is part and parcel of the world's case. The logical object of the verbs *hear* and *hearken* is the whole of the succeeding oracle, beginning, *Yahweh will become a witness against you*] Not *among you*,‡ for Micah certainly would not conceive of Yahweh as a fellow-witness with the heathen of Israel's calamities; but rather of these calamities as bringing home to their consciences a condemning sense of their own guilt and a warning to flee from the coming wrath; *i. e.*, Yahweh through his punishment of Israel will testify against the nations, who are even more guilty.—*His holy temple*] *i. e.*, his dwelling in the heavens,* not the temple at Jerusalem,† as the language of vv. $^{3.\ 4}$ shows. *Cf.* Hb. 2^{20} Zc. 2^{13} Is. 63^{15} Ps. 11^{4}. For similar views in early times regarding Yahweh's habitation, *cf.* Ex. $13^{21\text{ f.}}$ $14^{19.\ 24}$ $19^{11b.\ 18.\ 20}$.

---

* So Rosenm., Ew., Ke., Casp., Hd., Pu., Or., Che., We., GASm., Now., Marti.

† So Ki., Hi., Stei., Hal..

‡ So GASm..

Str. II introduces Yahweh himself upon the scene of action.—**3.** *Yea, see! Yahweh is coming forth from his place*] The picture becomes more vivid; the judgment is on the verge of execution! The *place* is the heavenly temple. *Cf.* Ho. 5^{15} Ps. 14^{2} Is. 18^{4}. —*He will descend upon the heights of the earth*] For the omission of the phrase, *and tread*, *v. s.* For a similar thought, *cf.* Am. 4^{13} (a late passage).—**4.** *And the mountains will melt*, etc.] The imagery here is based upon the phenomena of earthquakes or volcanic eruptions (*cf.* Is. 24^{19} Zc. 14^{4} Na. 1^{6}), and is not descriptive of a thunderstorm; the description of the rending of the valleys forbids the latter interpretation.—*Like wax before the fire, like waters poured down a declivity*] A later addition (*v. s.*). The volcanic stream of lava is the basis of this comparison.

Str. III states the cause of Yahweh's fearful wrath.—**5.** *For the transgression of Jacob is all this*] Jacob is here applied to the northern kingdom, as appears from l. 3. *All this* refers to the foregoing cataclysm, not to the threats of v. ^{6}.—*And for the sin of the house of Judah*] The prophet couples Israel and Judah in the bonds of iniquity. The coming punishment will include both. *Cf.* vv. $^{6.\ 9}$.—*What is Jacob's transgression? Is it not Samaria?*] The name of the capital, the centre of the nation's corrupt and licentious life, sums up the offence of Israel.—*And what is Judah's sin? Is it not Jerusalem?*] The two capitals are denounced by the prophet of the countryside not only for their own inherent sin, but also because they serve as sources of corruption infecting the whole land.

Str. IV presents the climax of the oracle in the clearly marked dirge-rhythm. The total destruction of Samaria is announced in terrible tones.—**6.** *Therefore will I turn Samaria into a field*] 𝔐 *ruin* is not suited to the following word, *field*, nor to the parallel phrase, *a planted vineyard*. Now.'s reading, *the forest of the field*, is too far removed from the received text and does not quite meet the demands of the parallelism; the term *forest* is not elsewhere employed to denote desolation. Samaria is to become an utter waste, a ploughed field (*cf.* 3^{12}), a vineyard in cultivation. A vineyard is the type of arable land less easily utilised for building purposes than any other, because of the great labour and loss involved in the transplanting of the vines (so Hal.). The hill of Samaria was very fertile and well adapted to vine-culture.—*And I will pour down her stones*, etc.] *Cf.* 1 K. 16^{24}. On the destruction of Samaria here foretold, *v. i.*. A total destruction of the city such as is here described was effected by John Hyrcanus (*v.* Jos., *Ant.*, XIII, 10, § 3). This, however, constitutes no valid argument for transferring this section of Micah to the Maccabaean period (*contra* Hpt.).

---

* Theiner, Rosenm., Hi., Mau., Hd., Ke., Che., Or., Now., GASm., We., Marti.
† Os., Geb., Hal., *et al.*.

7. This verse forms a five-line strophe, detailing the destruction of idolatry which is to accompany the downfall of Samaria. It is an expansion of Micah's message from the hand of a later scribe who interpreted the fall of Samaria as a judgment upon idolatry (*v. s.*).—*And all her idols will be shattered*] These were idols carved from stone or wood; shattering demonstrates their powerlessness. Samaria was notorious among later prophets for her idolatry. *Cf.* Is. 2^{20} $10^{10\text{ f.}}$ $27^{9\text{ f.}}$ 30^{22} 31^{7}.—*And all her images will be burnt with fire*] For the rendering *images*, *v. i.*. The usual rendering, *harlot-hires*, is wholly unsuited here to the vb. *burnt* and to the demands of the parallelism. For various attempts to escape the difficulty by changing the text, *v. s.*.—*And all her idols I will lay desolate*] A third word for *idol* appears here; Hebrew has no less than twelve words for this conception.—*For from the hire of a harlot they were gathered*], *i. e.*, not that the images were obtained by means of the gains of prostitutes,* but that they were made possible through the material prosperity which the people attributed to the favour of the Baalim (*cf.* Ho. 2^{5}).†—*And to a harlot's hire they will return*] If it be asked how these idols already shattered and burned can again become hire, the answer is that we must not confine a poet too strictly to prosaic fact. He evidently here is thinking of the use made by the heathen conqueror of the trophies of war;

---

* So Hal., *et al.*.

† So We., Or., Now..

these are presented to their deities in acknowledgment of their favour in bestowal of victory, and thus are designated by the prophet as harlot's hire.

Str. V reveals the prophet's anguish as he contemplates the fate of the city.*—**8.** *For this*] Not for the immediately preceding destruction of idols certainly, but for the destruction pictured in v. ^{6}, and because this destruction carries with it injury of the most serious character to the southern kingdom in which, of course, the prophet was especially interested. Calamity to Samaria means panic in Jerusalem.—*Let me lament and wail*] This dirge-like utterance, with its many terms for lamentation, is characteristically oriental in its vigorous and concrete expression of emotion; the repetitions secure emphasis and variety. The form in which the vbs. are used (with ־ָה) makes the lament even more tender and plaintive. This is one of several instances in which the man as patriot bewails most grievously the event which as prophet he is bound to announce. *Cf.* Je. $9^{1\,ff.}$.—*Barefoot and stripped*] Not naked, but in the dress of one in sorrow (2 S. 15^{30}); here and elsewhere (Is. 20^{2-4}) the reference is to a symbolic act in which the person thus garbed represents a captive.† The garment discarded was the outer cloak or tunic. *Cf.* Jb. 22^{6} Ex. 22^{26} Am. 2^{8}.—*Like the jackals*] The wail of these animals is a long, piteous cry (*cf.* Is. 13^{22}), and may be heard almost any night in Palestine, where the jackal is now the most common beast of prey.—*And mourning like the daughters of the desert*] The comparison is to the noisy, hideous screech of the ostrich.

Str. VI gives the justification for the prophet's grief which lies in the hopelessness of Samaria's outlook and in the fact that the calamity will include his own city, Jerusalem.—**9.** *For her stroke is incurable*] The reference is probably to the fall of Samaria in 721 B.C., together with the subsequent calamities which had befallen the city prior to the prophet's time (*v. i.*), and not to any one specific event.—*Yea, it comes even to Judah*] This is the burden of the patriot's soul, his all-consuming grief.—*It reaches unto the gate of my people*] Jerusalem is so designated as the seat of the central market-place of Judah and of the highest judicial tribunal, the natural gathering-point of Judah.—*Even unto Jerusalem*] The situation in the mind of the prophet is evidently that arising out of the campaign of Sennacherib* (*v. i.*), not that in connection with Sargon's expedition against Egypt ending in the battle of Raphia (719 B.C.).†

---

* The change of speaker (from Yahweh to the prophet) is not sufficient reason for suspecting that v. ^{8} is foreign to this context (*contra* Gu.). The vivid style of the prophets frequently leaps from one speaker to another without warning.

† Yet on Assyrian reliefs male captives are frequently represented as totally devoid of clothing. See, *e. g.*, the scenes on the bronze ornaments of the gates of Balawat.

The historical conditions amid which this oracle (1^{2-9}) was spoken are in dispute: Most interpreters have assigned it to the days immediately preceding the fall of Samaria in 722–721 B.C.; so, *e. g.*, Ew., Hi., Or., Dr.$^{\text{Intr.}}$, GASm. (725–718 B.C.), Hal., Now. (who thinks that the denunciation of Samaria was originally uttered prior to 722 B.C., but was later in its present form incorporated for greater effect in an oracle against Judah spoken in connection with Sennacherib's campaign). Others place it in the period of Sennacherib's invasion, 705–701 B.C.; so, *e. g.*, We., Sm. (*Rel.*, 237 *f.*), Cor., Marti. The narrative certainly looks upon the chastisement of Israel and Judah as something yet to come; there is no hint that Samaria has already been destroyed; the vbs. in v. ^{6} are indisputably future (*contra* GASm.). The two lands are indissolubly linked together in the coming destruction; their fate constitutes two acts of the same drama (Now.). The prophet may be standing on the verge of Samaria's fall in 721 B.C., and with keen insight into the meaning of the situation pointing out its ultimate significance for Judah, the fate of which he deems imminent. But the vividness of the description in $1^{9\,\text{ff.}}$ is more easily accounted for on the basis of calamities actually in progress in Judah than of events only anticipated in imagination. It seems better, therefore, to locate the prophecy in connection with the campaign of 705–701 B.C., and to suppose that the final destruction of Samaria occurred in connection with that event (so Cor., Marti). The desolation here described is not the result of a siege and deportation such as occurred in 721 B.C., but stops short of nothing less than total destruction such as did not take place till some later time. For further discussion, *v.* Introd., pp. 18–19.

2. שמעו וגו׳] These words have been borrowed by the editor of 1 K. 22^{28} as appears from (1) their omission in 𝔊's rendering of 1 K. 22^{28}, (2) their utter lack of connection there.—כלם] For other cases of כלם with 2d pers., *v.* 1 K. 22^{28} Jb. 17^{10} 2 Ch. 18^{27}; for very common lack of congruence of persons after a vocative, *v.* Kö. $^{\S\,344\text{ l. }333}$ ζ; *cf.* Nö., *Syr. Gram.*^{2}, $^{\S\,350\,\text{o}}$. Ges. $^{\S\,135\,\text{r}}$ cites רַבִּי, אֲדֹנָי, and יחדו as parallel cases of the loss of force in the sf.; but Brockelmann, *ZA.*, XIV, 344 *f.* explains יחדו by reference to the old adverbial ending *û*; while רבי and אדני did not wholly lose the force of the sf. in classical Heb.. The possibility remains that the process was hastened in the case of כלם and its transition to almost adverbial usage was facilitated by the similarity to the common adverbial ending in חִנָּם, יוֹמָם אוּלָם, רֵיקָם, אָמְנָם. *Cf.* Kö. $^{II.\ 255\ f}$.—וִיהִי] Juss. instead of impf. for rhythmical reasons (Ges. $^{\S\ 109\ k}$); here also to avoid unpleasant assonance with the immediately foll. יֶהְוֶה.—**3.** ממקומו] Here parall. with היכל (v. ^{2}). In early Semitic and Heb. literature מ' = *shrine*, *e. g.*, Gn. 28^{11} Je. 7^{12} Is. 18^{7} 2 K. $5^{11.\ 19}$; it came to be identified with the deity himself in the Mishna, Tosefta, Gemara, and Midrashic literature. Its application to Yahweh's heavenly temple is common in OT., *e. g.*, Ho. 5^{15} Is. 26^{21} Hb. 2^{20} (so J. A. Montgomery, *JBL.*, XXIV, 17–26).—**4.** כַּדּוֹנַג . . . כְּמַיִם] Use of generic art. in comparison in כַּד', but omitted in כְּמ'; note recurrence of מ in ^{4d}.—מֻגָּרִים] ἅπ.. Hoph. of נגר; We. suggests גרר = Assy. *garâru*, *run*, *flow* (so Hal.), while Hpt. connects it with מגר, *to fall*, as Pu. prtc. with initial מ om..—The omission of $^{4c,\ d}$ (*v. s.*) obviates the difficulty which leads Siev. to posit the omission of two lines from the original text of v. ^{3}.—**5.** מִי] Used for מָה only when the underlying thought refers to persons as here, Ges. $^{\S\ 137\ a}$. *Cf.* 1 S. 18^{18} 2 S. 7^{18}.—**6.** ושמתי] Of future action, Ges. $^{\S\ 112\ x}$.—מטעי כרם] *Cf.* the Assyrian phrase *ana tîli u karmi utir* = into a mound and a ruin I turned it.—**7.** יֻכַּתּוּ] So-called Aram. Hoph. (Ges. $^{\S\ 67\ g}$); rather than impf. Qal. pass. (Böttcher, Ges. $^{\S\ 53\ u}$).—אתנניה] A פסיל (Dt. 7^{5}), or an אשרה (Dt. 12^{3}), or even a במה (2 K. 23^{15}) may be burned, but not a harlot's *hire;* hence the suspicions against the text (*v. s.*). The best solution of the difficulty is to assign it to a new root, תנן having the meaning *resemble*, *be equal*, whence come for אתנן the signif. *image*, and *hire* (so Halper, *AJSL.*, XXIV, 366 *ff.*). Satisfactory evidence for such a root is furnished by Arabic *tânna* (III. conj. of *tanna*), *he measured*, *made comparison*, and the noun *tinnun*, *an equal*, *a like*. Support for the ascription to אתנן of these two conceptions, resemblance and compensation, is found in the usage of the parallel roots דָּמָה and שָׁוָה; Heb. דְּמוּת = *image*, *likeness;* Syr., *dmayā* = *value*, *price;* in Syr., Aram., and Arab., שוה = *was equal*, *like*, *worth*. תנן is thus closely related to שנה = *repeat*, rather than to נתן. From this point of view the use of אתנן here is seen to be paronomasia, very characteristic of Micah.—קִבָּצָה] On ◌ָ for ◌ֵ, *v.* Ges. $^{\S\ 52\ l}$. *Cf.* Ew. $^{\S\ 131\ d}$ (= Pŭ. with ĭ for ŭ); but the Vrss. and the syntax require the Puʽal plural.—**8.** אילכה] Fully written vowel only here, Ez. 35^{9} and Ps. 72^{14}; *v.* Ges. $^{\S\ 69\ b,\ note}$.—שׁילל] Kt. שֵׁילָל is ἅπ.; elsewhere שׁוֹלָל with Qr. (Jb. $12^{17.\ 19}$); *cf.* analogous formations, עוֹלָל and שׁוֹבָב; the Kt. finds no certain analogies in Heb., though they are numerous in Arab. *Cf.* Barth, *NB*, p. 54. The ◌ֵי here is probably due to the influence of the two preceding forms.—כתנים . . . כבנות] On pl. in comparisons, Kö. $^{\S\ 264\ b}$.—**9.** מכותיה] On pl. here, *cf.* Kö. $^{\S\ 348\ o}$.—נגע] On sg. masc. with fem. pl. subject as in 𝔐, *cf.* Kö. $^{\S\ 345\ d}$.

---

* So We., Now., Marti; *contra* Hal., Stk..

† GASm..

§ 3. *Lamentation Over Israel's Doom* (1$^{10-16}$).

In four strs. of four lines each, the prophet pictures desolation as it sweeps across the countryside with the march of an invading army. Wherever the blow falls, the piercing note of the dirge arises. (1) A call to some of the more northern towns to give themselves to mourning. (2) Disaster sent by Yahweh will smite the cities of Judah. (3) Let the inhabitants of Lachish and its environs flee in hot haste before the impending judgment. (4) Israel's territory will be in the hands of the foe, and her inhabitants will be carried into exile.

TELL it not in Gath;
In Baca, weep bitterly;
In Beth-ophrah, roll yourselves in the dust;
Pass ye over from Shaphir in nakedness.
THE inhabitant of Zaanan comes not forth from her fortress;
Beth-ezel is taken from its site.
How has the inhabitant of Maroth hoped for good!
For calamity has come down from Yahweh to the gates of Jerusalem.
BIND the chariot to the steed, O inhabitant of Lachish;
For in thee are found the transgressions of Israel.
Therefore thou givest a parting gift to Moresheth-Gath.
Beth Achzib has become a snare to the kings of Israel.
I WILL yet bring the conqueror to thee, O inhabitant of Mareshah.
Forever is Israel's glory to perish.
Make thyself bald and shave thee for thy darlings;
Enlarge thy baldness like the vulture's, for they will go into exile from thee.

This piece is the most remarkable, as well as most difficult and obscure of Micah's oracles. It is a dirge, the characteristic measure of which does not appear until Str. II, nor is it then perfectly sustained. On account of the uncertain state of the text, any attempt at reconstruction is extremely hazardous; hence this arrangement is presented with much hesitation. The only material excluded is v. ^{13b}, a gloss which interrupts the connection between ^{13a} and ^{13c}, in both of which direct address is employed. The arrangement by Siev. in seven strs. of two lines each, in perfect *Qîna* measure, is attractive, but it omits material arbitrarily and handles the text too roughly. The poem as a whole is denied to Micah by Marti (whom Siev. follows) on three grounds: (1) that it shows reflection upon the events it describes such as is inconsistent with stirring and painful times like the days of Micah; (2) that the use of the name Israel as including Judah is late; (3) that v. ^{13} contradicts v. ^{5b}. But the puns of the passage furnish no occasion for questioning the deep feeling of the author, since such usage was not inconsistent with great grief and was the furthest possible remove from any suggestion of humor. Its aim was rather to strike forcibly the attention of the listener. Similar usage in Am. 5[5] and Is. 10[27-32] bears witness to this, for Marti's rejection of these two passages as late rests solely upon the fact that they contain paronomasia, an insufficient basis. *Cf.* Is. 5[7] 6[11] 7[9] Gn. 49[3 f. 8. 16. 19]. Westphal well says (*Jahve's Wohnstätten*, 1908, p. 174): "For the ancients the word, the name, had a wholly different significance than for us. Puns were not for them mere plays upon words; but just as the name had a connection with the thing named so intimate as to transcend our perception, in like manner there was in the similarity of sound between two words a mystical connection of the things themselves; *nomen et omen* is a conception that developed upon the soil of antiquity." The name Israel as applied to Judah is characteristic of Micah (*v.* 3[1. 8. 9]). The supposed contradiction between v. [13] and v. [5] is only such as is due to the free impetuous utterance of the poet-prophet, which is not to be restrained within geometrically defined limits. In any case the exact significance of v. [13] eludes us.

10. בגת אל תגידו] 𝔊, *μὴ μεγαλύνεσθε* = תַּגְדִּילוּ. 𝔖, ܬܚܕܘܢ = תָּגִילוּ (unless 𝔖 is to be corrected with Seb. to ܬܚܘܘܢ). `Elh., בגלגל אל תגילו (so Wkl.Unt., 185 *f.*). Che. (*JQR.*, X, 573) and Hal., בְּגִלֹּה אל תגילו. But 𝔐 seems established by the duplicate in 2 S. 1[20].—בכו אל תבכו] Rd., בְּבָכָא בָכוֹ תבכו, dropping אל as dittog. from prec. line. 𝔊, *οἱ ἐν 'Ακεὶμ* (𝔖H, codd. Q marg., 87, 91, 310, Aldine ed., *ἐν βακεὶμ*) *μὴ ἀνοικοδομεῖτε.* Some codd. *ἐν 'Ακκαρειμ.* Comp. *ἐν βακεῖν.* But *ἐν 'Ακεὶμ*, as 𝔊's reading, is supported by 𝔏, *in Acim*, and 𝔄. 𝔊's *ενακειμ* recalls its rendering of עֲנָקִים in Dt. 2[10. 11. 21] Jos. 14[12. 15] 11[21. 22] as Che., *EB.*, 1646, suggests. In support of the emendation בְּבָכָא may be urged (a) the reading *ἐν βακεὶμ*, the last letter of which is a dittograph; (b) the pun thereby recovered; (c) the location of Baca in the region with which Micah is dealing; (d) the ease with which it might have disappeared from the Hebrew text. Reland, *Pal.*, בְּעַכּוֹ וגו' (so Zunz, Ew., Hi., Kl., Ro., Che., Taylor, Gu., GASm., van H.). In support of this are urged the analogies, נשקה = נשקעה, Am. 8[8]; בִּי = בְּעִי; כלה = בעלה, Jos. 19[3] 15[29]; לָמוֹ = לְעַמּוֹ, Ps. 28[8]; and the probability that the last letter of 𝔊, *ἐν 'Ακεὶμ*, is a dittog. from following *μή*. Against this Ry. well argues (1) that in the analogies cited the essential portion of the word has not been lost as here, except in בי, a much-used particle whose position at the beginning of its clause assures its proper recognition; (2) the remaining puns involve not merely the sounds of the words played upon, but also their sense; (3) the location of Acco, north of Carmel, is outside of the region with which Micah is immediately concerned, viz., the western slope of Judah. Mich., בִּבְכִים: (*cf.* Ju. 2[1. 5]; so Vol., Elh., Wkl.Unt., 186; Che., *JQR.*, X, 573; We., Now., Oort.$^{Em.}$, Du.); Elh. and We. also om. אַל, while We. changes the impf. to an imv. בְּכוּ. Gr., בַּבְכָאִים עָלֶיהָ ת׳. Hal., בְּבָכָא בְּכוּ אַל תָּפְגוּ. For בכו, 18 mss. of Kenn. בכה.—בבית לעפרה עפר] Rd., with 𝔖, בבית עָפְרָה עפר. *Cf.* Θ, Ὀφρά. 𝔊, *ἐξ οἴκου καταγέλωτα γῆν*, which seems to reflect some form of חפר. *Cf.* *καταγελασθήσονται* = וחפרו in 3^7. Σ, *drinking-bowls*. Elh., בבית לְעָפְרָה ע׳; so van H.. Pont, מִבֵּית וגו׳; so van H.. Oort$^{Em.}$, בבית עפרה בעפר. Gr., בבית־אל ועפרה. Wkl., *AOF.*, I, 103, בבית־אל עָפָר, om. עפרה as dittog..—התפלשתי] Rd. הִתְפַּלָּשׁוּ, with 𝔊, *καταπάσασθε*; so 𝔖 𝔙, Hartmann, Ro., Elh., We., Pont, Wkl., Gu., Now., Marti, Siev., van H., Gu.. Qr., 12 codd. of Kenn. and several of de R., הִתְפַּלָּשִׁי (so Schnurrer, Bauer, Taylor, Gr.). The pl. is demanded by the parallel vbs. of v. ^{10} and by לכם, v. ^{11}.—**11.** עברי לכם] Rd. עִבְרוּ ל׳, with some Heb. codd., 𝔙 𝔗, Aq., Σ, Hal.. 𝔊, *καταγέλωτα ὑμῶν*; *cf.* the rendering of לעפרה, v. ^{10}. 𝔏, *super derisum vestrum*. 𝔖, *Serve for thyself* = עבדי לך. Elh., לא עבר עליכם. Pont, לא עברה לכם. Che. (*JQR.*, X, 573) עָבַר, om. לכם. Marti, עִבְרִי לָךְ; *cf.* 𝔖. Siev. אֶבְלָה לָּהּ; so Gu..—ישבת שפיר] Rd. מִשָּׁפִיר, om. ישבת as dittog. from foll. line; the loss of מ from 𝔐 was due to its occurrence in immediately preceding לכם. 𝔊, *κατοικοῦσα καλῶς*. 𝔙, *habitatio pulchra*. Hal., מיושבת ש׳.—עריה בשת] Om. בשת, with 𝔊, as gloss upon עריה; so Ges.^{§131c}. *Cf.* Siev. 𝔊, *τὰς πόλεις αὐτῆς*. Θ, *ἡ πόλις αὕτη αἰσχύνη*. 𝔙, *confusa ignominia*. Elh., עָרֵי הַבֹּשֶׁת; so Pont, van H.. Hal., עריה ובֹשֶׁת. Siev. and Gu. om. בשת as dittog. of ישבת and rd. יֵרָאֶה for עריה. Marti, עֹטִיָּה בשת = *veiled in shame*. Che. (*JQR.*, X, 573) conjectures for the line: עָבַר בַּשְּׁבִי שַׁפְרִירֵךְ ישׁ׳ שפ׳.—צאנן] 𝔊, *Σενναάρ*; some codd. *Σεννάν*; others *Σαιννάν*. Aq., *Σαναών*. Θ, *Σανιών*. Σ, *εὐθηνοῦσα*. 𝔙, *in exitu*. 𝔏, *in aelam*. 𝔖 = *Zoan*. 2 codd. of Kenn. and 4 of de R., שַׁאֲנָן; *cf.* Σ. Van H., צרון.—מספד] Rd. מִסְפְּדָה. 𝔊, *κόψασθαι*. 𝔙, *planctum*. Van H., מָסַר, or מֵפֵר.—בית האצל] 𝔊, *οἶκον ἐχόμενον αὐτῆς*. 𝔏, *domum juxta eam*. Σ, *ἑξῆς*. 𝔙, *domus vicina*. 𝔖 𝔗 om. art. ה. 𝔖 treats מס׳ ב׳ הא׳ as subject of the clause. Elh., Pont, בית הָאָצֵל; *cf.* Zc. 14^5.—יקח] Gr., יֻקַּח.—מכם עמדתו] Rd. מִמְּעָמָדוֹ, כ being due to confusion with מ (*cf.* on 1^2) and dittog.. 𝔊, *ἐξ ὑμῶν πληγὴν ὀδύνης*; 2 codd. *πλὴν ὀδύνης*. 𝔏, *ex vobis plagam doloris*. 𝔙, *ex vobis quae stetit sibimet*. 𝔖 renders עמ׳ = *its blow*, the rendering of 𝔖 for מַכָּה in v. ^{9}. One cod. of de R., חמרתו; so 𝔗, Stei.. Ro., foll. Bauer, מכם מַכָּתִי, correcting 𝔊 to *πληγὴν αὐτῆς* (so Taylor). We., מַכַּת מָרוֹת, regarding *ἐξ ὑμῶν* as a doublet in 𝔊. Gr., מכם חֶמְדַּתְכֶם, using כי of v. ^{12}. Oort$^{Em.}$, יָקְחָה מֵעֶמְדָּתָהּ, for the last three words of 𝔐. *Cf.* Hal. יְקַדֶּמְכֶם עַד מָרוֹת. Che. (*JQR.*, X, 573) restores lines 1 and 2 of Str. II thus:—לְעוֹלָם תְּצַעַן ישבת צאנן מִסְפֵּד בְּבֵית הא׳ לֻקְּחוּ מִמֶּנּוּ אֲצִילָיו. Siev. conjectures:—יָרְעָה לֹא יָצְאָה ישׁ׳ צא׳ מִסְפֵּד בְּבֵית הא׳ כִּי־נֶאֱצַל עֶמְדָּתוֹ.—**12.** כי חלה] Rd. מִיְּחִלָּה; *cf.* 𝔊, *τίς ἤρξατο* = מִי הֵחֵלָּה; for confusion of כ and מ, *v.* on 1^2. Σ, *ὅτι ἐνόμισεν*. Θ, *ἀναμένουσα*. Aq., *ἠῤῥώστησεν*. 𝔙, *quia* *infirmata est;* similarly 𝔖. Taylor, הֶחִילָה. *Cf.* Pont, הֶחֱילָה. Oort$^{Em.}$, מָה יְחַלֶּה. We., Now., and Marti, כִּי יָחֲלָה. Siev. and Gu., מָרָה יָחֲלָה. Che. (*JQR.*, X, 573) כִּי חָלְתָה.—לטוב] Gr., לְטוֹבָה. Houb., לָמוּת; so Che. (*l. c.*). Hal., לֹא טוב.—מרות] 𝔊, *ὀδύνας*. Θ, *εἰς ὕψος* = רמות. Σ, *ἡ παραπικραίνουσα*. Aq., *Μαραώθ*. 𝔖, ܡܪ̈ܘܕܐ, confusing ו and ר. 𝔙, *in amaritudinibus*. 𝔗, שפר ארעא. Gr. and Che. (*l. c.*), ירמות; *cf.* Jos. 15^{35}.—כי ירד] Siev. om. כי.—לשער] Rd. לְשַׁעֲרֵי, with 𝔊 𝔖 𝔗, and codd. 295, 380, 789 of de R.; so Ro., Gu., Che. (*l. c.*), Oort$^{Em.}$, Now., Marti, Siev.. 𝔖 joins last two words of v. 12 to v. 13.—**13.** רְתֹם ה'] Rd. רָתֹם, inf. abs. with force of imv. (so Marti). 𝔊, *ψόφος ἁρμάτων*. 𝔙, *tumultus quadrigae*. 𝔖 = רְתְמָה מר'; so also Ro.. Ru., הֲמוֹן המ'. Gr., רְתֹק or רַתֵּק. Oort$^{Em.}$, רתמי. Hal., הִתַּמָּה. Che. (*l. c.*), צמרי מר'. *HWB.*^{15}, רתך (?); *cf.* 𝔗, רְתִכָּה = wagon.—לרכש] 𝔊, *καὶ ἱππευόντων*, connecting with v. 12 up to this point. 𝔙, *stuporis* = לרעש (Ry., Taylor). Ru., לְהָכִישׁ. Che. (*l. c.*), ורכים. Siev. and Gu., רֶכֶשׁ רְתֹם לַמֶּרְכָּבָה.—ישבת לכיש] 𝔊 𝔖 treat as subj. of foll. clause.—פשעי] Hal., פִּשְׁעֵי.—**14.** תתני] 𝔊 𝔙 = יִתֵּן. 𝔗, תְּשַׁדְּרִין. Ro., Oort$^{Em.}$, תְּתְּנִי. Marti, יִנָּתְנוּ; so Now.^{K}, Siev., Gu..—שלוחים] 𝔊, *ἐξαποστελλομένους*. 𝔙, *emissarios*. 𝔗 Aq., Σ Θ = *gifts*.—על] Marti, עָלַיִךְ; so Now.^{K}.—מורשה. 𝔊 𝔙 𝔖 𝔗 = *possession* or *inheritance*. Gr., מְאֹרֶשֶׂת, or dittog. from v. 15. Hal., transposing (אֶל־=) מורשת על. Che. (*l. c.*), לְמוֹרָשָׁה בַּת צִיּוֹן.—בתי] Rd. בית, with Che. (*l. c.*).—אכזיב] 𝔊 𝔙 𝔖 = *deceit* or *vanity*. Θ, *ἐξ ἀνάγκης* = אַכְזָר (Ry.).—לאכזב] Ro., לְאַכְזָב.—למלכי] Gr., לְמֶלֶךְ; so Che. (*l. c.*), Now. —**15.** עֹד] 𝔊, *ἕως* = עַד; so We., Che. (*Exp.* 1897, p. 368), Now., Elh., Siev., Gu..—הירש] Che. (*Exp.*), מְאָרֵשׂ.—אבי לך] 𝔊, *ἀγάγωσιν*; but cod. Q *marg.*, *ἀγάγω σοι*. Σ, *ἄξω*; so Θ 𝔖. Ten mss. of de R., אביא. Elh., אֹבִילֵךְ; so Pont, Che. (*l. c.*), Oort$^{Em.}$, Siev., Gu..—ישבת] 𝔊 adds לכיש (by dittog. of לך and the first two letters of ישבת) and makes מרשה the subject of the following יבוא.—עדלם] Rd. עוֹלָם, with 𝔖, ܥܠ̈ܘܠܐ; so Seb., Gr., Che. (*l. c.*), and Siev., who also restores מֵעֲדֻלָּם after יבוא (so Gu.). Mss. 112, 126 of de R., עדולם. Elh., עֻלָּם. Ry. restores עד עדלם עַד עֻלָּם. Marti, Du., עֲרֵלִים; *cf.* Che. (*CB.*). Van H., עֵילָם.—יבוא] Rd. יֹאבַד, with Che. (*Exp.*, 1897, p. 368), Siev., Gu.. Gr., יביל (?). Hal., יָכוּם. Elh., after יב', inserts ישבת עֲדֻלָּם, carrying כב' י' over to v. 16 (so also Ro.). —**16.** קרחחך] 𝔊, *χηρείαν* = *widowhood*, probably an error for *κουράν* (so Schnurrer, Schleus., Ry.).—גלו] Gr., יגלו.

Str. I issues a general call to lamentation.—**10.** *Tell it not in Gath*] A vivid appeal to those fleeing from before the invading army not to humiliate their native land by making its ruin known to their hostile neighbours. These words, freely quoted from the elegy on Saul and Jonathan (2 S. 1^{20}), at once indicate the character of the oracle and constitute an appropriate opening of this dirge. There is no sufficient reason for omitting them as a marginal note, either by Micah himself * or by later readers,† intended to call attention to the parallel between this and the earlier lament. The resemblance between the two is hardly close enough to have suggested such a parallel to any reader. It is more probable that the phrase had taken on proverbial force and was used by Micah as an opening line which at once would suggest the nature of his poem. It seems almost certain that Gath had fallen prior to the time of Amos (6^2) and that it never recovered from this blow. It is not mentioned with the other four cities of Philistia either by Amos (1^{6-8}), Zephaniah (2^{2-7}), Jeremiah (47), Zechariah (9^{5-7}), or the books of the Maccabees.—*In Baca weep bitterly*] 𝔐, *weep not at all*, is open to the objections that it is inconsistent with the form of phrase in the parallel lines where a verb is in each case coupled with a noun, that it is exactly the opposite of what the prophet might have been expected to say under such circumstances as these, and that it makes it difficult to account for the rendering of 𝔊 (*v. s.*). The name "Baca" is applied to a village on the northern border of upper Galilee (*v.* Gu., *Bibelatlas*, map 13), to a *wady* discovered by Burckhardt near Sinai and to a portion of the valley south-west of Jerusalem extending toward Bethlehem and mentioned in Ps. 84^6. This last is the only one of the three that at all suits the requirements of this context.—*In Beth-ophrah roll yourselves in the dust*] The *Beth-le-aphrah* of 𝔐 is a name otherwise unknown; it likewise constitutes the only case of a preposition following *Beth* in a proper name. The form *Beth-ophrah* here adopted is preserved in 𝔖 and Θ. The correction involved is a slight one and preserves the paronomasia so characteristic of this passage, and therefore seems preferable to the reading "Bethel" (*v. s.*). The action called for symbolises a frenzy of despair.—**11a.** *Pass ye over from Shaphir in nakedness*] 𝔐 in this line is badly corrupt; every word is more or less doubtful. But the general sense is clear and supports the translation here offered. The picture is that of a band of exiles being led away by their conqueror. The location of *Shaphir* is uncertain. The most probable identification is with

---

* So Ry..

† So We., Now., Marti.

Sawâfir, SE. of Ashdod; it is less likely an error for *Shamir* (Jos. 15^{48} Ju. $10^{1.\,2}$), a city in Judah.—*In nakedness*], *i. e.*, in the garb of a captive, deprived of the outer robe (*v.* on 1^{8}).

Str. II sets forth the conditions which enforce the call to mourning.—**11b, c.** *The inhabitant of Zaanan comes not forth from her fortress*] Here the punning continues as in Str. I. Zaanan is perhaps identical with צנן (Jos. 15^{37}), which was in the Shephelah. 𝔖 thinks of צען, *i. e.*, Tanis or Zoan in Egypt. The suggestion is that of a people barricading itself in its city, afraid to face the oncoming foe.—*Beth-ezel is taken from its site*] 𝔐, with the addition of the last word in the previous line, is translated by RV., *the wailing of Beth-ezel shall take from you the stay thereof.* But this is unintelligible, as is every other attempt to translate 𝔐. *Cf.* GASm., *the lamentation of Beth-ezel takes from you its standing.* The above rendering rests upon an emended text (*v. s.*). The description is that of a city razed to the ground. The town *Beth-ezel* is nowhere else mentioned (*cf.* אֵצַל, Zc. 14^{5}), and was evidently unknown to the Greek translators (*v. s.*).—**12.** *How has the inhabitant of Maroth hoped for good!*] But the help longed for has failed to come. Maroth (= *bitterness*) is a wholly unknown village or town; it would seem to have been in the vicinity of Jerusalem in view of the close connection of this line with the following. RV. renders 𝔐, *For the inhabitant of Maroth waiteth anxiously for good;* but it should rather be *is in agony for good*, which yields no satisfactory sense.—*For calamity has come down from Yahweh to the gates of Jerusalem*] Yahweh is here represented as enthroned in the heavens (*cf.* 1^{3}), whence he sends down chastisement upon his wicked people. It is not necessary to suppose a siege of Jerusalem actually in progress; the prophet rather in this way pictures the imminence of the danger that threatens.

Str. III continues the elegiac measure begun in the last two lines of Str. II. Here are described the flight of inhabitants and the loss of territory.—**13.** *Bind the chariot to the steed, O inhabitant of Lachish*] The paronomasia here is in the similarity of sound between רכש, *chariot*, and לכיש. The translation, *bind*, is somewhat conjectural, but seems required by the context. Lachish is identical with Tell-el-Ḥesy, sixteen miles NE. from Gaza and two miles

S. of Eglon;* it was formerly incorrectly identified with Umm Lakis, a little farther north. Tell-el-Hesy lies at the base of the foothills of the Shephelah in a fertile valley opening off the road to Egypt. Láchish thus constituted a frontier fortress between Judah and Egypt, and was always a place of strategic value. Rehoboam fortified it (2 Ch. 11^9) and Sennacherib captured it and established temporary headquarters there during the campaign of 701 B.C. (Is. 36^2 37^8). A bas-relief now in the British Museum portrays his capture of the city.—*She is the chief sin of the daughter of Zion*] This parenthetic statement seems foreign to the context, and is probably a marginal note by some reader or editor (*v. s.*). The grounds upon which so serious a charge is based are unknown; some have supposed that Lachish was the seat of some grossly licentious cult;† others base its guilt on the supposition that it was one of the chariot cities established by Solomon (1 K. 10^{26} 2 Ch. 1^{14} 8^6).‡ The best hypothesis is that "as the last Judean outpost toward Egypt, and on a main road thither, Lachish would receive the Egyptian subsidies of horses and chariots, in which the politicians put their trust instead of in Jehovah." § *Cf.* Ho. 14^4. Until we know more definitely the nature of the charge against Lachish or the circumstances under which it was uttered, the possibility must remain open for the rendering, "she is the beginning of sin, etc."—*For in thee are found the transgressions of Israel*] The address is to Lachish, not to the daughter of Zion.** The use of "Israel" is not to be explained as meaning that the sins responsible for Samaria's downfall are now regnant in Judah.†† "Israel" rather indicates the whole of Yahweh's people and territory of which Judah is now the more important part; on this use of "Israel," *v. s.*. The order of words would seem to show that the thought is not that Lachish is characterised by such sins as are common to all the cities of Israel, but that the responsibility for the general guilt rests largely upon Lachish; this is in harmony with the gloss in the previous line. No hint is given as to the nature of the sin laid to the account of Lachish. It is, of course, possible that this oracle was uttered after Hezekiah had sent tribute to Sennacherib at Lachish (2 K. 18^{14-16}), and that Micah here expresses his judgment concerning that transaction.—**14.** *Therefore, thou givest a parting gift to Moresheth-Gath*] This is better than to treat 'Gath' as a vocative,* or to consider Moresheth-Gath as the one addressed,† which necessitates a change of text, or to transpose the preposition and render, "thou shalt give Moresheth as a parting gift to Gath." ‡ The address is to the daughter of Zion who is now to dismiss with the proper present one of her villages. The word used here for gift is that employed in 1 K. 9^{16} to designate the dowry given by Pharaoh to his daughter. There was probably an intentional play here on the words מוֹרֶשֶׁת and מְאֹרֶשֶׂת (*betrothed*).§ Judah will lose the town and pay tribute besides. The site of Moresheth-Gath can only be conjectured. The form of the name would imply proximity to Gath, but unfortunately Gath's location is doubtful. Moresheth-Gath was probably near the Philistine border; Jerome declares that a small village near Eleutheropolis (Beit-Jibrin) on the east bore the name in his day. This is the region in which Lachish lay. Micah's appellation, "the Morashtite," was probably derived from this place. Much depends upon this interpretation, for otherwise no information is at hand concerning the prophet's home or origin.—*Beth Achzib has become a snare to the kings of Israel*] 𝔐, *the houses of Achzib.* Achzib is not the old Phœnician town (Jos. 19^{29} Ju. 1^{31}),** as might appear from the phrase *kings of Israel.* Israel here represents Judah as in line 2, and the plural *kings* is generic. Achzib has been and still is for Israel's king a false hope, a brook whose waters have dried up. *Cf.* Je. 15^{18}. The play on words here is between *achzib* and *achzab.* The exact site of Achzib has so far eluded discovery. Jos. 15^{44} locates it in the Shephēlah of Judah, in the vicinity of Libnah, Keilah and Mareshah. How so comparatively unimportant a place as Achzib evidently was (for it plays no part elsewhere on the pages of Hebrew history) could have been a snare to the kings of Israel must remain a mystery. The view of Hitzig, that Achzib had been in the possession of Philistia since the reign of Ahaz and that Judah had always entertained the hope of its recovery which is now doomed to disappointment, is wholly without foundation.

---

* See F. J. Bliss, *A Mound of Many Cities, or Tell-el-Hesy Excavated*. The excavations were begun by J. F. Petrie and completed by Bliss.

† So, *e. g.*, Now..

‡ So, *e. g.*, We., van H..

§ GASm., 384 *f.*.

** *Contra* van H..

†† *Contra* van H..

---

* We.^{1}.

† So We., Now., Marti.

‡ So Hal..

§ So Hi., We., Now., Marti, van H..

** *Cf.* Ew. and Ro., who find here an allusion to *both* towns, the northern and the southern.

Str. IV. continues in the elegiac strain, and reaches its climax with an announcement of the doom of exile.—**15.** *I will yet bring the conqueror to thee, O inhabitant of Mareshah*] The play here is on *yôrēsh* and *Marēshah.* Even Mareshah, rejoicing in its name, *a possession,* shall not escape the hand of the conqueror, the dispossessor. The modern *Merâsh,* two miles S. of Beit-Jibrin, answers the geographical requirements for the site of Mareshah as indicated here and in Jos. 15^{44} and by Eusebius, who locates it two miles S. of Eleutheropolis. But the excavators have thrown doubt upon its identity with the ancient Mareshah (*v. i.*). It is evidently to be distinguished from Moresheth-Gath. The places with which the prophet has been concerned in this oracle are thus seen to be in all probability those in the immediate vicinity of his own home, places with which he had been familiar from childhood. They were scarcely of any significance in the great world, but to him and his fellow-villagers they represented home, country and religion, all that they held dear.—*Forever is Israel's glory to perish*] 𝔐, *unto Adullam shall Israel's glory come,* defies interpretation; that most generally accepted is, the nobility of Israel shall take refuge in a cave. *Cf.* 1 S. $22^{1\,f.}$. Adullam, perhaps the modern *'Id-el-mîje,* six miles NE. of Beit-Jibrin, was originally the seat of a Canaanitish prince (Jos. 12^{15}), but was captured by Israel and incorporated in the territory of Judah (Jos. 15^{35}). Of the various attempts to improve the text, that of Cheyne seems the best and is here adopted. The *glory of Israel* is probably the wealth and power of Judah which constitute the seal of Yahweh's approval upon her.—**16.** *Make thyself bald and shave thee for thy darlings*] Zion is here addressed as a mother and bidden to go into mourning for the loss of her beloved children. *Cf.* Je. 31^{20}. Reference is had to the cities and villages she has lost, with their inhabitants.—*Enlarge thy baldness like the vulture's*] The vulture is distinguished from the eagle by its bare head and neck. Shaving of the head was a common mourning custom. *Cf.* Am. 8^{10} Is. 3^{24}. Originally instituted, in all probability, as a sacrificial offering to the departed spirit, it later came to be obnoxious to the sensitive religious conscience of the prophets, who would permit no divided allegiance among the followers of Yahweh. Such practices were therefore prohibited by the Deuteronomic Code (Dt. 14^{1}; *cf.* Lv. 21^{5}). The fact that this verse summons Judah to such a rite, even figuratively, attests its origin in days prior to the enactment of the Deuteronomic law.* This verse, moreover, seems to grow right out of the preceding context and so adds strength to the argument for Micah's authorship of this whole passage (1^{10-16}).—*For they will go into exile from thee*] Thus ends in familiar but terrible fashion the lamentation over Judah's approaching punishment. The warning note sounded first of all by Amos and Hosea in northern Israel now finds its echo in the southern kingdom. With this picture of an invading army, giving the advance in detail, village by village, is to be compared the similar passage, Is. 10^{28-32}.

10. בגת] The location of Gath is uncertain; the OT. data are too fragmentary to make identification possible; nor are the Assyrian or Egyptian records any more satisfactory. The two sites most attractive are Beit-Jibrin and Tell-es-Safi. In either case Gath was the nearest of the five chief Philistine towns to the border of Judah. The excavations at Tell-es-Safi by Mr. Bliss in 1899 unfortunately yielded little, the greater part of the mound being occupied by the modern village and two graveyards, under which excavation is absolutely prohibited. The town stood "as a natural fortress between the plain and the rolling country." The origin of the town goes back as far as the seventeenth century B.C. according to Bliss. *Cf.* F. J. Bliss and R. A. Stewart Macalister, *Excavations in Palestine During the Years* 1898–1900 (1902), pp. 28–43 and 62 *ff.*. Jerome says that Gath lay on the road between Eleutheropolis and Gaza; hence Hpt. suggests 'Arâq el-munšîyah, less than two hours from Tell-el-Ḥesy.—בכו] For the form, *cf.* עָשׂוֹ (Je. 4^{18} 7^{5}) and רָאוֹ (Is. 6^{9}).—אל־תבכו] This and 1 K. 3^{26} are the only cases of אל and an infin. abs. modifying a finite vb., and in both cases the neg. follows the regular rule for לא and other negatives in standing immediately before the finite form.—לְעַפרה] Ophrah, the home of Gideon, in Manasseh (Ju. $6^{11.\ 24}$ $8^{27.\ 32}$) is out of the question as too far removed from the scene of Micah's thought. Another Ophrah, mentioned in Jos. 18^{23} and 1 S. 13^{18}, is usually identified with Tayyibeh, five miles N. of Bethel. But this latter, lying outside of Judah on the north, seems too remote to be satisfactory here. The same objection holds for the reading 'Bethel,' if the northern town is meant, which lies ten miles from Jerusalem and about twenty-five miles from the region of Micah's home. For those who incline toward this reading, it is safer to regard the Bethel referred to here as the one listed among the towns of the Negeb in 1 S. 30^{27} Jos. 15^{30} ($𝔊^B$); *cf.* Jos. 19^4 1 Ch. 4^{30}. The suggestion of GASm. that our 'Ophrah is reflected in the name of the Wady el-Ghufr, lying south of Beit-Jibrin, is most attractive.—התפלשתי] This form is probably due to a desire to pun on the name Philistia. Qr., התפלשי, is probably due to the singular forms of v. ^{11}.—עברי לכם] For a similar lack of agreement in gender and number, Kö. $^{\S 346s}$ cites Je. 13^{20}; but there the text is exceedingly doubtful, for the Qr., many mss. and the Vrss. make the agreement regular.—עריה בשת] Apposition, Ges. $^{\S 131c}$; Kö. $^{\S 285o}$.—מספד] 𝔐 is here unintelligible. By connecting מ' with the previous line (*v. s.*), יצאה is there furnished with its necessary complement and this line is relieved of a troublesome element. סָפוּר (*v. s.*) is a noun conjecturally restored on the basis of Assyrian *supûru*, 'enclosure' (of a walled city, *e.g.*, Erech); *v.* Dl.$^{HWB.}$, 509, Muss-Arnolt, 779.—יקח] For the sense *take away*, *carry off*, *cf.* Ez. 3^{14}.—מכם עמדתו] There is nothing in the immediate context to which the pron. כם can refer. It is easy to account for a כ between two מ's as a dittog. of מ in the old script. Furthermore, עמדה is ἁπ., yields no sense in 𝔐, and was evidently not present to the eye of 𝔊 𝔏 𝔖. Prefixing the מ's restored from מכם the form מִמעמדו is recovered without difficulty, and may be derived from מַעֲמָד, *station*, *post*, or from מָעֳמָד, *standing-ground*.—**12.** מרות] The *Meroth* in upper Galilee which Josephus mentions (*Wars*, III, 3, 1) is certainly not meant here. But no southern locality bearing that name is available.—כי־חָלָה] According to 𝔐, כי must be given the meaning *verily*, for there is no subordinate relation to the preceding or following context. ח' means *writhe in pain* and is wholly unsuitable before לטוב.—לשער] For the sg. as in 𝔐, *cf.* Taylor, *Cyl. of Sennacherib*, col. 3, ll. 22 *f.*, "the exit of the great gate of his city I caused to break through."—**13.** רְתֹם] For other cases of the masc. form in an address to a fem. subj., *cf.* Ges. $^{\S 110k}$, Kö. $^{\S 205c}$. It is better pointed as an inf. abs. having the force of the imv.. The translation *bind* is reinforced by the Assy. *ratamu* = *wrap*, *bind* (*v.* Muss-Arnolt, 991) and the Arab. equivalent which in the fourth form = *tie a thread upon the finger as a reminder.*—ר' חטאת] Van H. renders, *the beginning of the expiation of*, etc., but the meaning *expiation* for ח' is not attested earlier than Zc. 14^{19}, a postexilic passage, and is closely related to the late priestly use of the word in the sense *sin-offering*.—**14.** שלוחים] *i.e.*, the dowry given with the bride by her father. *Cf.* document C of the Assuan Papyri, published by Sayce & Cowley, where the custom is witnessed to as current among the Jews of the Dispersion as early as the sixth century B.C.. *Cf.* Code of Hammurabi which evidences the same practice in Babylonia as early as 1900 B.C.. The use of the term here is suggested by the similarity of מֹרֶשֶׁת to מְאֹרֶשֶׂת, *betrothed;* it is one of the earliest allusions to the existence of the custom in Israel. *Cf.* Ju. 1$^{12-15}$ Gn. 29$^{24.\ 29}$.—עַל] After נתן more common preps. are ל and אל; perhaps על is used here in the sense *with, along with.*—מורשת גת] Analogous names cited by GASm. are Atroth-Shophan (Nu. 32$^{3.\ 35}$), Chisloth-Tabor (Jos. 19$^{12.\ 18}$), Iye-Abarim (Nu. 33$^{44\ f.}$), and Helkath (Jos. 19^{25}).—**15.** עֹד] Not *again*, but *still, even yet.* The change to עַד (with 𝔊) makes necessary corresponding changes in the remainder of the line which yields reasonable sense as it stands.—אבי] For other cases of omission of א, *v.* Ges.$^{\S\ 74\ k}$.—מרשה] The modern Merâsh seems to date no further back than Roman times, if we may judge by the slight depth of debris upon the site. The actual site of this ancient town may be represented by the modern Tell-Sandaḥannah, one mile SE. of Merâsh. The remains of an ancient town are evident there, and it is no uncommon thing for a town name to migrate to a new site along with the inhabitants, as, *e. g.*, in the case of ’Umm Lakis. *Cf.* F. J. Bliss and R. Stewart Macalister, *op. cit.*, pp. 67 *f.*.—עַרְלָם] The correction to עולם (*v. s.*) removes one of the grounds for changing עֹד to עַד in l. 1 (*v. s.*), and for supposing הירש to represent the name of a town (We., Now.).

---

* So even Marti, who assigns vv. $^{10-15}$ to a later hand.

§ 4. *The Oppression of the Poor* (2$^{1-11}$).

In six strs. in which the elegiac strain is predominant, Micah denounces the tyranny of the rich and warns them of coming judgment. **Str. I**, the prophet speaks: Woe to those who plot night and day to despoil their neighbours of houses and lands. **Str. II**, Yahweh speaks: For this reason I am about to bring upon this people a humiliating and unbearable yoke. **Str. III**, Yahweh continues: Then the wail of the mourner will arise among you, ‘Our land is allotted to others; we are wholly undone!’ **Str. IV**, the rich oppressors speak: Cease prating of such things. We are immune from calamity. Is Yahweh impotent, or can he mean anything but good to his own people? **Str. V**, Yahweh retorts: But ye are destroyers of my people, robbing and plundering them and driving the women and children into slavery. **Str. VI**, Yahweh pronounces sentence: Rise and begone! Because of your sins, ye shall be hopelessly destroyed.

WOE to those who devise iniquity upon their beds;
In the morning light they execute it, because it is in their power.
Yea, they covet fields and seize them, and houses and carry them off.
So they crush a yeoman and his house, a man and his heritage.
[Therefore thus saith Yahweh:]
BEHOLD I am devising disaster,
Which ye cannot remove from your necks;
Nor will ye be able to walk erect,
For it will be a disastrous time.
IN that day a taunt-song will be raised concerning you;
And a lament will be wailed, as follows:
The portion of my people is measured with the measuring line, and there is none to restore it.
To our captors our land is allotted; we are utterly devastated.
DO not keep harping on such things.
Shame cannot overtake the house of Jacob.
Is Yahweh impatient, or are such his deeds?
Do not his words mean good to Israel?
BUT ye have become my people's foe; ye rise up against those that are at peace.
Ye strip off from those passing by in confidence booty of war.
The women of my people ye drive away from their pleasant homes;
From their babes ye take away my glory forever.
ARISE and go! For this is not your resting-place.
Because of uncleanness ye shall be destroyed with an irremediable destruction.

This section is dramatic in form, three different speakers being brought forward, viz., the prophet, Yahweh, and the greedy oppressors. Its unity and artistic form are both strongly marked. The prevailing movement in the six strophes is that of the *Qîna*, except in Str. II, where the announcement of coming disaster is in short and sharp phrases. The closing str. pronouncing final sentence drops to two lines. The prosaic character of the first two lines of Str. III and their lack of conformity to the metre of the balance of the str. raise the question whether they do not constitute the prose introduction to a new section; but the close connection of the thought of this str. with that of the preceding and the regular interchange of speakers throughout the entire passage seem to prohibit a division of the poem at this point. The more important textual changes which affect the form are the following: the omission of ופעלי רע from v. [1], and of על המשפחה הזאת from v. [3]; Sta.'s reconstruction of v. [4]; the omission of v. [5] as a prosaic interpolation (so Ru., Now., Marti, Siev., Gu.); the omission of האמור from v. [7] and of ארר from v. [8]; the treatment of v. [11] as a prosaic gloss originally belonging to v. [6]; its relation to v. [6] was already recognised by Dathe (1773 A.D.) and, more recently, by Hal., who transposes v. [6] to follow v. [11]. The introductory words in v. [3] lie outside of the poetic form. Siev. omits much material from this section in his effort to restore anapæstic hexameters here, and then finds his scheme break down in vv. [8-10].

2^{1}. הוי] 𝔊, ἐγένοντο = הָיוּ.—ופעלי רע] Hal., וּפָעֲלֵי רע; *cf.* Du., חשבי פֳעֲלֵי רע.—באור הבקר] 𝔊 renders freely, καὶ ἅμα τῇ ἡμέρᾳ. *Cf.* 𝔖.—יעשוה] Hal., יַעֲשׂוּם.—כי יש לאל ידם] 𝔊, διότι οὐκ ἦραν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν; probably a free rendering for 'their hand is against God,' viz., they do not lift their hands to him in prayer. This seems simpler than the supposition that 𝔊 read יִשָּׂא under the influence of נשאו in the foll. verse and that οὐκ was inserted later in order to make the passage convey the right impression. 𝔖 foll. 𝔊, but om. its negative. 𝔙, *quoniam contra Deum est manus eorum.* Aq., ὅτι ἰσχυρὸν χεὶρ αὐτοῦ. Θ, διότι ἔχουσιν ἰσχὺν τὴν χεῖρα αὐτῶν. Cod. 24 (de R [illegible]. Siev. om. the phrase.—**2**. וגזלו] 𝔖 om.; so also Siev.. 𝔊 adds ὀρφανούς as obj., probably as a free rendering.—ונשאו] 𝔊 𝔙 om. וְ. 𝔊 seems to have transposed ונשאו and ועשקו; for נשא is nowhere else rendered by καταδυναστεύειν, nor is עשק elsewhere represented by διαρπάζειν; whereas καταδυναστεύειν is a common rendering of עשק and διαρπάζειν, though not elsewhere used for נשא, well conveys the idea of violence that נ׳ must carry in this context. The transposition may have been made deliberately by 𝔊, in order to avoid the immediate repetition of διήρπαζον, which had already occurred as the equivalent of וגזלו; so Vol., Ry.. *Cf.* the similar transposition of נתכה and נתצו by 𝔖 in Na. 1^{6}.—איש] 𝔖 om.. 𝔊^{B}, Aq., Σ and many Heb. mss. = ואיש. On metrical grounds, Siev. om. איש ונחלתו (so Gu.).—אשר] Marti om. as gloss.—משם] Om. מש as dittog. from תמישו (*cf.* Kenn. 30, which om. משם) and join final ם with the foll. word as prep., מִצַּוְארֹתֵיכֶם. This obviates two difficulties: first that of making שָׁם, which has only local significance, refer to the abstract antecedent רעה; second, the more natural object of תמישו is a word referring to the yoke, not to the neck; *v.* Ho. 11^{4} Je. 28^{14} Is. 52^{2}, but *cf.* Je. 27$^{8.\ 11.\ 12}$ Ne. 3^{5}.—רומה] 𝔊 adds ἐξαίφνης, possibly due to metathesis resulting in מַהֵר (for רמה written defectively) and allowed to stand alongside of the correction ὀρθοί; so Ry.. 𝔊^{A}, ὄρθροι.—**4**. ונהה] 𝔗 om..—נהיה] Om., with Sta. (*ZAW.*, VI, 122 *f.*) as dittog.; so Taylor, We., Pont, Ru., Now., Oort$^{Em.}$, Marti, Siev., Stk., Gu.. 𝔊, ἐν μέλει, and 𝔙, *cum suavitate*, seem to have taken it as fem. of נהי and treated it adverbially. Ro. and Elh. read נְהִי in cstr. relation with foll. word. Gr., יִנְהֶה; so GASm. (?). Hal., נֹהֶה. Van H., יַהְוֶה, as subj. of the foll. vb..—אמר] Rd. לֵאמֹר, with Sta., Taylor, We., Pont, Ru., Now., Oort$^{Em.}$, Siev., Stk., Gu.; *cf.* 𝔊^{A}, λέγων; 𝔙, *dicentium.* Ro., אֹמֵר (so Hal.) or הָאֹמֵר (so Elh.). GASm., ואמר (?).—שדוד נשדנו] Tr., with Sta., to the end of the verse; so Ru., Now., Stk.. 𝔖 = יְשָׁדֵנוּ unless due to confusion of the Heb. preform. נ with the Syr. preformative of the 3d pers..—חלק עמי] Marti, Siev. and Gu., חֶלְקֵנוּ. Van H., ח׳ עַמִּי.—ימיר] Rd., with Sta., יִמַּד בַּחֶבֶל, foll. 𝔊, κατεμετρήθη ἐν σχοινίῳ; similarly 𝔖; so Gu., Ru., Now.. חבל is obtained here from v. ^{5}, whither it probably dropped by error. This reading of the vb. is accepted also by Ew., Stei., Taylor, We., Pont, GASm., Oort$^{Em.}$, Marti, Siev., Stk., Du.. Gr., יָמֵר. Hal., יָמֹר.—איך] Rd., with Sta., וְאֵין, foll. 𝔊, *καὶ οὐκ ἦν*, and 𝔖; so Pont, Ru., Now., Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, Stk.; also Dathe, We. and Du., dropping וְ. Hal., איה.—ימיש] Rd., with Sta., מֵשִׁיב, foll. 𝔊, *ὁ κωλύσων*; so Ru., Now., Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, Stk.. 𝔖 om.. We., הַמֵּשִׁיב. Pont, מֵמִישׁ. Hal., המורד. Marti, יַמְשִׁלוּ, using foll. לִיל. *Cf.* Siev. and Gu., ימשלו לִי. Du., מוֹשָׁב.—לִי] Om. with 𝔖 as dittog.; so Sta., Ru., Now., Stk.. 𝔊 = לוֹ; so Taylor, Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, Du.. 𝔗, לְהוֹן. Van H., לֹא. Gr., לָנוּ.—לשובב] Rd., with Sta., לְשׁוֹבֵינוּ; so Pont, Ru., Now., Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, Stk.. 𝔊 Σ Θ treat as an infin. depending upon ימיש. Aq., *τοῖς γείτοσι*. 𝔙, *cum revertatur*. 𝔖 𝔗 om. לְ. Marti, שׁוֹבֵינוּ. Gr., וּלְשֹׁבֶה. Siev., שׁוֹדְדֵי.—שדינו] 𝔊$^{\text{AY}}$ 𝔏 = שְׂדֵיכֶם.—יחלק] Rd., with Sta., יְחֻלַּק; so Pont, Gr., Ru., Marti, Stk.. 𝔊, *διεμηρίσθησαν*. 𝔖, *with the measuring line*. Siev. om. שד' יח' as a gloss. Two Heb. codd. יֵחָלֵק. Hal., שָׂדַי זוּ חֻלַּק.—5. לכן לא] Elh., וְלֹא.—לך] Pont, לכם; so Ru., Marti. Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, לָנוּ.—משליך ח' בגורל] Tr. חבל to v.^{4} (*v. s.*). 𝔖, *one who will measure by line and divide by lot*. Ru. om. חבל ב.—6. אל תטיפו] Rd. אַל הַטֵּף, with Ru., Siev..—יטיפון] Rd. נָטִיף, with Taylor. 𝔊, *δάκρυσιν*; so 𝔖. 𝔙, *loquentes*. Aq., *σταλάζοντες*. Σ, *ἐὰν ἐπιτιμήσητε*. Ru., נְטִיפִים. Elh., מַטִּיפִים.—לא יטיפו] Om. as dittog.. 𝔖 = 2d pers. תטיפו; so codd. 295 (de R.) and 154 (Kenn.). 𝔙, *non stillabit*. Ru., וְלֹא יט'.—יסג] Rd., with Gr., יַשִּׂיג; so *HWB*.^{15}, Marti, Now.$^{\text{K}}$, Siev., Gu., Hpt.. 𝔊, *ἀπώσεται* = יַסִּיג; so Ru., van H., Du.. 𝔙, *comprehendet*. 𝔖, *overtake you*. Aq., *καταλήψῃ*. Codd. 224 (Kenn.) and 554 (de R.), יִסַּג; codd. 150, 226 (?), 201 (second hand) of Kenn., and 2, 380, 993, 1257, 411, 211 of de R., ישג. Elh., יַשֵּׂג. Hal., יַשִּׂיגוּ.—כלמות] 14 codd. (Kenn.), כְּלֵי מָוֶת. Elh., כְּלִמּוּת. Ru., גְּבוּלָם.—7. האמור] Rd. הָאֹמֵר, with 𝔊, *ὁ λέγων* and 𝔗 (so Dathe, Bauer, Jus.), and om. as a gloss, with Marti, Siev.. 𝔙, *dicit*. 𝔖 treats as pass. prtc. agreeing with כלמות. Ki., הָאָמוּר; so Ew., Stei., Casp., Kl., *et al*.. Ro., הֶאָמוּר; so Dr., *Exp*., X (1887), 263. Taylor, הַאָמַר. Gr., המורים or הממרים. Ru., וְהֶאֱמִין. Hal., הֶאֱזִינָה. Van H., הֶאֱמִיר.—בית] Now., מִבֵּית.—הקצר] 𝔊, *παρώργισεν*; so 𝔖.—אם] 𝔖 = עִם.—דברי] Rd., with 𝔊 and cod. 305 (de R.), דְּבָרָיו; so Gr., Gu., Ru., Now., Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, Marti, Siev..—הישר הלך] Rd. ישראל, with Now., Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$. 𝔊, *καὶ ὀρθοὶ πεπόρευνται*. Taylor, י' הֹלְכִי. Ru., וְקָמָה יִשְׁרָתוֹ לוֹ. Marti, Now.$^{\text{K}}$ and Gu., יִשְׂרָאֵל עַמִּי. Hpt., הי' ההלך אחריו.—8. ואתמול עמי] Rd. וְאַתֶּם לְעַמִּי, with WRS., *Proph*., 429, and GASm.. Cod. 89 (Kenn.), ואתמל. Cod. 159 (Kenn.), האתמול. Cod. 300 (Kenn.), וְאֶת־מוּל; so Ro., Taylor, Elh., Pont, Hal.. Hi., ואל־מול. Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, כאתמול, taking כ from v.^{7}. We., וְאַתֶּם עַל ע'; so Now., Siev., Van H., Du.. Marti, וְאַתֶּם, omitting ל as dittog. from לאיב, and transferring עמי as עַמִּי to end of v.^{7}. Gu., וְאַתֶּם, and om. ול עמי.—יקומם] Rd., with We., תָּקוּמוּ; Now., Marti, Siev., Gu.. WRS., יקום; so Taylor, Elh., Pont, Gr.. *HWB*.^{15} and van H., קָמִים, giving י to איב as sf. י. *Cf.* GASm., Du., וָקָם.—ממול] Rd., with Marti, עַל. We., מֵעַל; so Gr., Now., Siev..—שלמה] Rd., with We., שְׁלֵמִים; so GASm., Now., Marti, Gu.. 𝔊, τῆς εἰρήνης αὐτοῦ = שְׁלֹמה; so 𝔖, WRS.. Oort$^{Em.}$, שְׁלֹמֹה (*cf.* Ps. 7⁵). Ro., שַׁלְמָה. Elh., Pont, שָׁלֵם. Hal., שָׁלֹם. Van H. joins with foll. word and reads שלמנאצר = *Shalmanezer.*—אדר] Om., with Marti, as gloss on שלמה; so Now.^{K}, Siev.. 𝔊, τὴν δορὰν αὐτοῦ, giving 'א its Aramaic force (so Büchler, *ZAW.*, XXX, 64 *f.*) as in Gn. 25²⁵; so 𝔖. WRS., אַדֶּרֶת; so Taylor, Gr.. Elh., הָאַדֶּרֶת; so Pont. Hal., הָאֶדֶר.—מעברים] 𝔊, τοῦ ἀφελέσθαι = מֵעֲבִירִים; so 𝔖. Ru., לְהַעֲבִיר. Siev., מֵעֵבֶר.—שובי] Rd., with We., שְׁבִי; so Now., Marti, Siev., van H., Gu., Hpt.. Cod. 17 (Kenn.), שבי. 𝔊, συντριμμόν = שֶׁבֶר. 𝔙, *convertistis.* 𝔖, *and ye turn.* Σ, ἀμερίμνως. Hoffmann (*ZAW.*, III, 103), שׁוּבֵי. Taylor, שְׁבוּרֵי (so Elh.) or שָׁבֵי (so Ges., § 72 p). Gr., שְׂנֻאֵי. Ru., שְׁבוּרֵי. Oort$^{Em.}$, שברי. Matthes, with foll. word, שֹׁבְרִים לַחְמָם; so Elh., Pont.—**9.** נשי] 𝔊, ἡγούμενοι = נְשִׂיאֵי. 𝔗, כְּנִישַׁת, *the assembly.*—מבית] We., מִבְּנֵי (*cf.* 1¹⁶); so Now., Marti, Siev., Gu..—תענגיה] Rd., with 𝔖 𝔊, תַּעֲנֻגֵיהֶן; so Gr., Ru., Marti, Now.^{K}, Siev., Gu., Hpt., Du..—עלליה] Rd., with 𝔖 𝔊 𝔙, עֹלְלֵיהֶן; so Gr., Ru., Marti, Now.^{K}, Siev., Gu., Hpt., Du.. 𝔊, τὰ πονηρὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα αὐτῶν ἐξώσθησαν, the last word, ἐξ', being perhaps a second rendering of the following תקחו.—תקחו] 𝔊, ἐγγίσατε.—הררי] 𝔊, ὄρεσιν = הררי. 𝔖 om. sf.; so Oort$^{Em.}$. Hal., הֲדָרָהּ.—**10.** טמאה] Rd., with Ro., מְאֻמָה; so Elh., Pont, Gr., Oort$^{Em.}$, Marti, Now.^{K}, Stk.. All Vrss. except 𝔗 treat it as a noun.—תחבל וחבל] Rd., with 𝔊, תְּחֻבְּלוּ חֶבֶל; so Ro., Taylor, Gr., Perles, Now., Oort$^{Em.}$, Marti, Siev., Stk., Gu.. 𝔖 reproduces 𝔐 with addition of a cognate acc. חבל after תחבל. 𝔙 = תְּחֻבַּל ח'; so Bauer, Jus., Elh., תְּחֻבַּל ח'.—נמרץ] 𝔊, κατεδιώχθητε. 𝔙, *pessima.* 𝔖, *violent.* Gr., וְהֻרָץ; so Marti, Now.^{K}, Siev., Stk., Gu..—**11.** לו] 𝔊 = לֹא. 𝔖 om.. 𝔙, *utinam non essem.*—הלך] We., הֹלֵךְ; so Now., Marti, Siev., Gu..—מטיף] 𝔊, ἐκ τῆς σταγόνος. 𝔙, *super quem stillatur.*

Str. I utters a woe upon men zealous toward evil, who abuse their power by robbing the poor of their houses and lands.—**1.** *Woe to those who devise iniquity*] The address is made to the wealthy in Judah, whose riches had greatly increased during the long and prosperous reign of Uzziah. Their greed not satisfied, they would still more enrich themselves, and that at the expense of greater poverty and misery for the poor. Micah's spirit flames forth in indignant remonstrance, for these suffering farmers include many of his neighbours and friends.—*And work evil*] This is a prosaic gloss* as is shown by the fact that it comes in prematurely—the evil is not done 'upon the bed' but 'in the morning'—and that it is superfluous in the metre. GASm. seeks to retain the phrase by giving to פעל the meaning, "prepare ways and means"; but this is a usage not found elsewhere and one that adds nothing to חשב of the previous phrase.—*Upon their beds*] They lie awake at night revolving schemes to circumvent the poor. *Cf.* Ps. 36^{4}.—*In the light of the morning*] Brought into contrast by chiasm with the night-work of arranging plans. They can scarcely wait for daylight before putting their nefarious schemes into operation.—*Because it is in their power*] They oppress and rob because they can. This interpretation is supported by Θ and Aq. and by the usage of the same phrase in Gn. 31^{29} Dt. 28^{32} Pr. 3^{27} Ne. 5^{5} BS. 5^{1} 14^{11}. The interpretation, "because their power is their God," common in the older commentaries* is rendered impossible by some of the parallel cases cited in which the phrase is negatived.—**2.** *They covet fields and seize them*, etc.] Their only title to them is their greed. To the prophet's vivid imagination it seems 'no sooner said than done.' He leaps over the intermediate steps between the birth of the desire and its fulfilment, such as extortionate rates of interest, foreclosure of mortgages, subornation and perjury of witnesses, bribery of judges. So it was in the days of Ahab (1 K. 21), of Hosea (5^{10}) and Isaiah (5^{8}). For the peasant prophet, born and bred upon the vine-clad hill-slopes of western Judah, the ousting of peasant-farmers from their small holdings, inherited through successive generations of toilers whose very life had gone into the soil, was a wholly unpardonable crime. No amount of legal procedure could make it appear right. Custom and law, from the earliest to the latest times, all sought to perpetuate the family's tenure of its ancestral lands. *Cf.* Nu. 27^{1-11} 36^{1-12}.—*So they crush a yeoman and his home*, etc.] The inevitable result of their heartless policy,—the property gone, the man and his family must succumb. גֶּבֶר and איש are used for variety, there being no essential difference in their ordinary usage.

---

* So We., Now., Oort$^{Em.}$, Marti, Siev., Gu., Du., Hpt., *et al.*.

Str. II introduces a new speaker, Yahweh himself. In trimeter movement and pointed phrase, Yahweh declares his purpose to punish.—**3.** *Behold, I am devising disaster*] This, in contrast with **Str. I**, represents Yahweh as the deviser, not, however, of iniquity, but of calamity. In 𝔐 this line is broken up by the insertion after the vb. of the words, *against this family*], *i. e.*, the people of Judah. The phrase is a gloss,* as appears from its abnormal position in the sentence and from its metrical superfluity. *Cf.* Am. 3^1 Je. 8^3.—*Which ye cannot remove from your necks*] 𝔐 = *that ye shall not withdraw your necks therefrom.* For text, *v. s.*. The figure is that of a yoke, heavy and galling; it is a common metaphor in the prophetic books, *e. g.*, Is. 9^4 10^{27} 47^6 Je. 27^8 28^{14} Ez. 30^{18} 34^{27} Dt. 28^{48}.—*Nor walk erect*] *i. e.*, because bowed down by the crushing weight of the yoke.—*For it will be a disastrous time*] There is no sufficient ground for considering this a gloss with some recent scholars.† It states the accomplishment of Yahweh's purpose as indicated in the first line of the str., and thus brings the str. to a well-rounded close.

---

* So, *e. g.*, Mich., Stei., Mau., Ke., Ro., Reinke, Kue., Du..

Str. III represents Yahweh as putting upon the lips of Israel's foes a dirge describing the smitten state of the nation in the coming day of wrath.—**4.** *A taunt-song will be raised concerning you, and a lament will be wailed*] It is evident from the indefinite character of the verbal forms employed that the dirge is pronounced not by the sufferers themselves but by others. This is in keeping with ordinary funeral customs. *Cf.* Am. 5^{16} Je. 9^{17}. This makes it clear that the precise character of the מָשָׁל is defined by נְהִי as *a satirical dirge.* This is better than to treat *māshāl* as describing the gibes of the foe, and *nᵉhî* as applying to Israel's own lamentation;‡ or to eliminate both these introductory phrases as inconsistent with the contents of the dirge.§—*The portion of my people is measured with the measuring line, and there is none to restore it*] In this taunt-song the triumphant foe mockingly re-echoes the thought of Judah in the day of her calamity. *Portion of my people* is equivalent to *our land* in the next line. *Cf.* Gn. 31^{14} 2 K. 9^{36} Ez. 48^{21} Am. 7^4. The process of allotting Israel's territory to her conquerors for perpetual possession is here graphically portrayed.—*To our captors our land is allotted; we are utterly devastated*] The foe is unnamed, but Micah and his hearers understood equally well that reference was made to Assyria. The foregoing rendering of v. $^{4b.\,c}$ involves some slight rearrangement and modification of 𝔐, which reads: *We are utterly devastated; the portion of my people he changes; how doth he remove for me! to a rebel he apportions our land.* The difficulty with this is its lack of inner coherence, its failure to indicate the subject of the verbs in the last three clauses, the interchange of numbers in the pronouns of the first person and the failure to conform to the *qîna* measure which the introduction leads us to expect. —**5.** *Therefore, thou shalt have none that shall cast the line by lot in the assembly of Yahweh*] This verse lies outside of the poetical form, and is to be considered as an annotation by some reader or editor which has found its way from the margin into the text. It cannot be joined to v. ^{4} as a part of the reproach by the enemy,* for the address is here evidently to only a part of the nation, and the parallelism of v. ^{4} is wholly lacking. Nor is it satisfactorily accounted for as a retort to Micah from those he has been castigating,† for this leaves the *therefore* without any support in the context. It is more easily taken as a resumption of the prophet's address to the wicked,‡ לְךָ being treated as a distributive singular or as an error for לָכֶם; but the verse adds nothing essential and varies widely in form from its context and is a later interpretation of v. ^{4} to the effect that the wicked oppressors will no longer increase their huge estates at the expense of the poor, for rich and poor alike will be denied foothold in Yahweh's land. The use of חֶבֶל, *line,* with מַשְׁלִיךְ is unique, while גּוֹרָל, *lot,* is common in such a connection; perhaps חבל here belonged originally to v. ^{4}, where it has been supplied above on the basis of 𝔊.

---

* So Marti, Now.^{K}, Siev., Gu.. Stk. substitutes עליכם.

† Viz., Marti, Now.^{K}, Siev., Stk., Gu.. ‡ *Contra* Hi., Mau., Or., Reinke. § Marti.

Str. IV expresses the indignant protest of the rich who regard such preaching as disloyal and irreligious. The elegiac rhythm is continued.—**6.** *Do not keep harping on such things*] Treatment of this kind was no new experience for prophecy; it antedated Amos (2^{12}), and Amos himself was bidden to keep silence (5^{10} 7^{10-13}), as also Isaiah ($28^{9.\ 10}$). By the time of Manasseh it had developed into actual persecution (2 K. 21^{16}; *cf.* Je. 11^{18-23} $26^{10\text{ ff.}}$). The verb employed here is practically synonymous with נבא, the ordinary word for *prophesy*, yet lends itself readily to an unfavourable connotation by reason of its original meaning, viz., *drip, drop, i. e.*, of the foam from the mouth of ecstatic, epileptic *nebi'im.* 𝔐 of this line has been variously treated, *e. g.*, using the last two words of v. [5], "In the assembly of Yahweh do not prophesy" (an address to Micah and his associates by his opponents, to which Micah replies): "Whether they (*i. e.*, the prophets) preach or do not preach to such as you, shame, etc." * Or again, as the utterance of two or three of the audience taken up by Micah into his address, *i. e.*, one says, "You must not speak," a second replies, "O, let them speak," while a third adds, "They must not speak such things as these." † Yet again, as a protest of the rich cited by Micah, "prate not," they prate, "let none prate of such things." ‡ This latter is the best interpretation and the most widely accepted one, but it does not account for the interchange of אל and לא, nor render the change from 2d to 3d pers. anything but abrupt.—*Shame cannot overtake the house of Jacob*] This includes the first words of v. [7]; for text, *v. s.*. The rich continue speaking here. The thought out of which this confidence springs is that of Am. 3[2]: Israel is Yahweh's chosen people and therefore safe from harm. *Cf.* 3[11]. It is the creed of the established régime, which is ever too ready to identify God's interests with its own. From the point of view of the rich, Micah is guilty of both treason and blasphemy. A single word, האמר, attached as a marginal note to call attention to the fact that the "house of Jacob" is *the speaker* in this and the following lines, has crept into the text here and caused much difficulty. The first part of the line as in 𝔐 may perhaps be rendered, *reproaches do not depart*, though the verb סוג elsewhere always conveys an element of disgrace as attending the movement expressed by the verb, *e. g.*, 'backslide,' or 'be driven back in defeat,' or 'prove recreant'; the second part eludes explanation as may be seen from the various attempts to make sense, *e. g.*, "O thou who art called the house of Jacob"; § "O words of the house of Jacob"**; "What a word! O house of Jacob"††; "O thou that speakest thus to the house of Jacob"‡‡; "Should it not be said, O, etc."§§; "Shall one say to the house of Jacob?"[*]; "Is this the talk of the house of Jacob?"[†]. —**7.** *Is Yahweh impatient or are such his deeds?*] Is not Yahweh "slow to anger" (*cf.* Ex. 34^6), and has not our entire history demonstrated his beneficent purpose toward us?—*Do not his words mean good to Israel?*] This was the difficulty encountered by all the prophets—the failure on the part of the people to realise that Yahweh's favour was conditioned upon the character of his people, and that no amount of ritual or protestations of loyalty could supply the lack of truth and justice. The great task of prophecy, therefore, was to inform the national conception of God with moral content. 𝔐 reads here, *do not my words mean good to him that walketh uprightly?* But this necessitates joining the line as an utterance from Yahweh with v. ^{8} and constitutes very bad Hebrew for the last clause. Of the various emendations (*v. s.*) offered, the foregoing best suits the demands of the context.

---

* Van H.. † Hi., Now. (?). ‡ Ew., Ke., GASm..

---

* Ro.. *Cf.* van H.

† M. Jastrow, in Frankel's *Monatschrift*, 1872.

‡ GASm., *et al.*.

§ Cal., Ke..

** Rosenm., Mau..

†† Ew., Casp., Stei., Um..

‡‡ GASm..

§§ Hi..

Str. V, in the words of Yahweh himself, makes crushing reply to the protest of the rich oppressors, "How can you expect good when your deeds are evil?" The elegiac strain continues.—**8.** *But ye have become my people's foe*] The Hebrew text of this verse is badly corrupt; for the emendations adopted, *v. s.*. As emended it is an address to those who have been so loud in their resentment of Micah's message of woe. 'You yourselves are Israel's worst enemies.' 𝔐, *Formerly my people as an enemy raised up*, etc., offers no proper object of the transitive 'raise.'—*Ye rise up against those that are at peace*] The rich make hostile plans against the unsuspecting poor to compass their spoliation and destruction. The most common treatment of 𝔐 is to connect the verb 'rise up' with the first line, to draw תפשטון from the following line to this one, and translate, *from upon the garment ye pull off the robe.* The outer and more expensive garment is seized as security for debt, in violation of Ex. $22^{26.27}$. But the preposition מול regularly means 'in front of,' and the word אֶדֶר, not occurring elsewhere in this sense, is better considered as an error for the ordinary word אַדֶּרֶת, which was added on the margin by some reader as a more specific designation of the garment in question after the original שלמים had become שַׂלְמָה.—*Ye strip off from those passing by in*

---

[*] Dr., *Exp.*, 1878.

[†] Or..

confidence booty of war] The words of this line are not to be taken literally; the prophet is not necessarily speaking of actual highway robbery; his thought is rather exactly parallel to that of the preceding line: "You take advantage of innocent, trusting neighbours and plunder them as though they were enemies." 𝔐 is very difficult; the best rendering of it is, if אדרת may be connected with this line, *the mantle ye strip from those who pass by in security, averse to war;* but שׁוּבֵי is not found elsewhere, and the meanings given to it have been many and various.—**9.** *The women of my people ye expel from their pleasant homes; From their babes ye take away my glory for ever*] *i. e.* in their greedy haste to "join house to house and lay field to field," they do not hesitate to render families homeless or even to sell the fathers into slavery for debt. Wellhausen, *et al.*, substitute "children" for "homes" (*v. s.*), and interpret the verse of selling into foreign servitude which deprives the little ones of ever living in the land of Yahweh. But it is very questionable whether so heinous a crime is referred to here; the laws on slavery seem not to have contemplated such a dire possibility, for they make not the slightest allusion to it; the only case in the Old Testament is the sale of Joseph to the Midianites by his brethren—an altogether abnormal transaction. Furthermore, the phrase "my glory" cannot well mean 'the glory of dwelling in Yahweh's land,' for this does not reflect glory upon Yahweh, while the thought of 'glory granted to the people by Yahweh' would be more naturally designated "their glory." Then too, the vb. 'expel' suits 'home' better than 'children,' and the preposition 'from upon' suits better the removal of fathers from their children than the taking away of the privilege of residence from the latter. For the use of the term 'glory' as applied to men, *cf.* Is. $5^{13. 14}$. The yeomen of Israel might well be designated as Yahweh's glory.

Str. VI is Yahweh's curt, summary dismissal of the guilty to their irrevocable doom.—**10.** *Arise and go! for this is not your resting-place*] Those who have driven out others are now themselves to be driven out.—*Because of uncleanness, ye shall be destroyed with an irremediable destruction*] Men strict in their observance of ceremonial law, no doubt, are here brought face to face with their own inner depravity and Yahweh's insistent and terrible demand for "clean hands and a pure heart."—**11.** *If a man walking in a spirit of falsehood lies, saying, "I will prophecy to thee of wine and strong drink," he becomes the prophet of this people*] This verse is a later addition as shown by its prosaic form and by its lack of connection with its immediate context. It seems to have been suggested partly by the contents of v. ^{6} and partly by the severe terms of v. ^{10}. In contrast to the denunciatory Micah with his relentless message, a picture of the popular prophets is presented. To them Micah pays his respects in $3^{5\,\text{ff.}}$. This rendering of v. ^{11} adopts a use of הלך quite common (*v. i.*) and treats רוח ושקר as a case of hendiadys. An alternative rendering for the phrase is "walking in vanity (or emptiness) and falsehood"; for this use of רוח, *cf.* Is. 41^{29} Jb. 7^{7} 15^{2} Ec. 1^{14}. To "walk in a spirit of falsehood" and preach lies is to deceive people deliberately, and is far worse than to deceive unwittingly. The substance of the false teaching is the promise of material prosperity and blessings of the most sensuous character. This is the only thing that will content the populace; they will not listen to the words of the true prophet whose message, however unpalatable, is born of supreme devotion to their highest good. To change הולך to the perfect tense as some do (*v. s.*) involves either an awkward asyndeton for the verb כזב or else the separation of the phrase רוח ושקר between the two verbs thus, "if a man walk in wind and falsely lie, saying, etc." The שקר however is redundant as a modifier of כזב and the phrase is much better taken as a unit and modifying הולך.

1. ופעלי רע] For the meaning 'prepare,' 'work out in advance,' reference is had to such passages as Ps. 7^{14} 58^{3} Is. 41^{4}. This thought is certainly present in Ps. 58^{3}, if the text is sound; but even there the idea of 'planning' is not in the vb. פעל itself, but is plainly expressed by the phrase 'in the heart' which is attached. The question at issue is whether פ׳ may have that sense in itself, without such modifying phrase. It is clearly not required in Is. 41^{4}, where the two vbs. פ׳ and עשה are more naturally treated as exact equivalents, being rendered 'who hath wrought and done it.' Nor is there any reason in Ps. 7^{14} for departing from the usual sense; when the psalmist says that Yahweh 'makes his arrows,' he surely does not imply that Yahweh 'devises' or 'plans' them beforehand. —לאל] In the sense of 'strength,' 'power,' אל is found only in this idiom. Nor can this meaning be definitely connected with the $\sqrt{}$ אול. But the context of the various occurrences of the phrase seems to demand this sense; 𝔊 in all cases save this one gives it this force; likewise 𝔖 and 𝔗. The alternative rendering, "their hand is as a god," is quite unnatural when the phrase is negatived and, as Nö. has indicated, would require the Hebrew היתה להם ידם לאל, while the ל after יש and אין must be a genuine dative. Recently, however, this latter view has been revived in somewhat different form. Brockelmann, *ZAW*. XXVI ('06), 29 *ff*., calls attention to the belief found among many peoples that the various members of the body are tenanted by spirits which control their activities. But such beliefs among American Indians, West Africans and ancient Persians prove nothing for the Hebrews; nor is the Arabs' belief that hunger is due to a serpent in the stomach any more convincing, even though serpents and spirits are frequently identical. Whitehouse, *Isaiah* (*Cent. Bible*), II, 344, explains on this same basis the use 'throughout the Mediterranean littoral' of the facsimile of a hand as a 'prophylactic to the depredator or the evil eye'; but surely it is not necessary to limit ourselves to this theory for an explanation of the magic hand. The objections urged above hold good in part against this newer view, while the conception "god of my hand" remains at present without any real Semitic parallel. In any case, if such a concept ever did exist in early Israel, it had long passed out of the consciousness of the people in Old Testament times.—**2.** ונשאו] A bold figure; nowhere else does נ' בית occur.—**3.** רומה] On adv. use of the subst., *cf.* Ges. $^{118\,q}$.—**4.** ישא] The indefinite is often, as here, equiv. to a passive, like German *man*, French *on*.—נהיה] According to Kö. $^{\S\,91}$, the fem. of נהי (so the Vrss., Ry., *et al.*) and used alongside of the masc. to express indefiniteness; but in Kö. $^{\S\,309\,k}$, cited as expressing the superlative idea; *cf.* Is. 3^1. Others, *e. g.* Ew., Hi., Che., have taken it as Niph. pf. of היה, meaning 'it is done,' either as the title of the dirge, or as its first word, viz. "it is done," will one say, "we are, etc."; but such a use of אמר is quite abnormal.—שדוד נש'] The dirge rhythm always consists of a longer line followed by a shorter, usually in the proportion 3 : 2; 𝔐, however, exactly reverses that order here. On נשדנו, *cf.* Ges. $^{\S\,67\,u}$.—לי] Acc. to 𝔐, *dat. ethicus*, Ges. $^{\S\,119\,s}$.—לשובב] 'ש = apostate, rebel; here of Assyria, and so inappropriate; in Je. 49^4, of Ammon, which was, like Israel, a descendant of Abraham and thus could properly be charged with having deserted the faith of the fathers; in Je. 31^{22}, of Israel itself. 𝔊 connects it with the preceding as an infin..—**5.** משליך חבל] 'ח as an obj. of שלך forces upon the latter a meaning, such as 'stretch' or 'adjust' (van H.), which it does not elsewhere have, nor can it easily assume.—קהל] is consistent with late origin of the verse, but does not demand it, for 'ק occurs in E (Nu. 22^4), Ju. 20^2 $21^{5.\,8}$ 1 S. 17^{47}—all early. Nor is any specific Messianic idea implied in the use of the term (*contra* Marti); it is a designation applicable to Israel by foreigners (Nu. 22^4) or to foreigners by Israelites (1 S. 17^{47}). 'ק' יה here is synonymous with "the people of Yahweh," or "the inheritance of Yahweh."—**6.** אל תטיפו יטיפון לא יטיפו] On orig. force of הטיף, *v. ZAW.* III, 119. Or. accounts for change from אל to לא by making Micah begin to reply with לא י׳ in the form of a question, "shall one not preach to such as these?". If 𝕸 be retained, the only treatment of לא י׳ is as a positive prohibition by the rich, "they shall not preach such things." For inf. abs. Qal with Hiph. impf. as in emended text, *v.* Ges.$^{\S 113 w}$.—יסג] For other cases of vb. in sg. masc. before a fem. pl. subj., Ges.$^{\S 145 o}$; Kö.$^{\S 348 i}$.—On the intensive pl. כלמות] Kö.$^{\S 261 h}$; the change to sg. (Now.) is unnecessary, nor need בית י׳ be made the subj. (Marti).—**7.** האמור] As it stands, this can be only a Qal pass. prtc., either with the article, or with ה interrog. (Ges.$^{\S 100 n}$; Kö.$^{\S 353 w}$) with gerundive sense, "is it to be said?" *Cf.* Kö.$^{\S\S 236 b.\ 323 e \beta}$. But *v. s.*.—אם] This indirect question does not propound two alternatives, but rather two phases of the same thought; Ges.$^{\S 150 b}$; Kö.$^{\S 353 o}$.—עם הישר הולך] An adv. use of ישר "one walking as the righteous," *i. e.* righteously. But the order of words is difficult. Jb. 31^{26}, ירח יקר הלך, is not a parallel case, for there ירח is the main word to which יקר ה׳ is attached as an attendant circumstance, while here the main word is הלך and comes last. Not only so, but the use of the article with ישר is an additional difficulty. Indeed in Jb. 31^{26} there is no reason for treating יקר as other than an ordinary adjective and rendering 'a glorious moon as it passed along' Kö.$^{\S 332 i}$, cites the analogy of the Hâl clause in Arabic, which permits this order when the governing word is a participle as here. On the use of article with ישר and its absence from הולך, *cf.* Wright, *Arab. Gram.*$^{\text{II. pp. 116 D. 117 B}}$.—**8.** ואתמול] This word is without force in this context; Micah is concerned not with the dead past, but the living present.—עַמִּי] It is not unlikely that this is a dittog. of עם in the last clause of v.^{7}, or has been dislodged from its place after ישראל (*v.* emended text); so Marti, Now.^{K}. Such an arrangement yields a smoother sentence here, but is not indispensable.—יקומם] 𝕸 requires עמי as subject, but as a transitive form it requires also an object which is not forthcoming. Furthermore, the succeeding vbs. are all in 2d pers. pl..—ממול] The collocation of four מ's is suspicious, as also the unsuitability of this prep.,= *from in front of*, to the noun שלמה] This designates the ordinary outer garment, while אדר], to be read אדרת (ת being lost before תפ׳; so BDB.), applies to the mantle, or cloak, worn as an overcoat. But this seems too detailed and petty in the present context.—שובי] On the gen. relation instead of a prep., *cf.* Kö.$^{\S 336 m}$; on the pass. prtc. denoting a state or quality, *cf.* Kö.$^{\S 235 d}$. But the harshness of this ἀπ. idiom seems to call for correction of the text; *v. s.*. The most serious objection to the emendation שְׁבִי is that in its ordinary sense of 'captives' or 'captivity' it does not constitute a suitable object for הפשטון. But Am. 4^{10}, עם שבי סוסיכם, furnishes a use of שבי very close to that called for here.—**10.** טָמְאָה] Some Heb. mss. followed by Baer read טָֽמְאָה, *i. e.* pf. 3d sg. Qal; but this is difficult after בַּעֲבוּר, whereas the inf. cstr. of 𝔊 is a normal construction foll. prep.. But smoother sense results from the noun-form טֻמְאָה, *uncleanness* (*HWB.*^{15}), which it is better to follow than to posit the ἀπ. noun טְמָאָה (BDB.).—**11.** הֹלֵךְ רוּחַ] An acc. designating the goal or sphere of the action, Kö.$^{\S 330 s}$, *cf.* ה׳ חשֶׁךְ, Jb. 29^3; ה׳ בשקר, Je. 23^{14}; ה׳ עקשות פה, Pr. 6^{12}. There is no need to change the text (*v. s.*); the idiomatic use of 'walk' as designating a manner of life is common enough to justify 𝔐.

§ 5. *The Return of the Exiles* ($2^{12. 13}$).

A later editor, in a single eight-line str., prevailingly trimeter in movement, offsets the announcement of exile made in § 4 by a promise of Israel's return from exile under the protection and leadership of Yahweh.

I WILL surely assemble Jacob, all of him;
I will surely gather the remnant of Israel.
I will put them together like a flock in the fold,
Like a herd in the midst of the pasture.
The breaker will go forth before them;
They will break through the gate and go forth thereat;
And their king will pass on before them;
Yea, Yahweh at their head.

This arrangement involves two modifications of 𝔐; (1) the omission of the last two words of v. ^{12} as a gloss, (2) the omission of ויעברו from v. ^{13} as a dittograph of ויעבר in the following line. The str. shows a gradual diminution in the length of its lines, from tetrameter through trimeter to dimeter (in the last line only). Marti obtains a ten-line str. by retaining all of 𝔐 and beginning his eighth line with שער notwithstanding its close relation to the preceding vbs. as object. Siev. secures four of his indispensable 'sevens' by omitting שארית and the last two words of v. ^{12} and supposing a loss of one foot after שער.

The difficulty of establishing any connection between these verses and $2^{1\text{-}11}$ has long been felt. The history of interpretation records various treatments. Among others, it has been interpreted as a continuation of the threatening language of v. ^{10}, *i. e.* "I will gather them to destruction, etc."; so *e. g.* Ki., Ephraem Syrus, Theodoret, Grotius, Tarnovius, Cal., and in recent times van H.. Again, as the teaching of false prophets, either spoken by Micah himself, viz. 'if I prophesy to this people of wine, etc., and say to them, "I will gather, etc."' (so *e. g.* AE., Mich., Struensee); or as a marginal note by Micah or an early reader representing the contents of false prophecy (so *e. g.* Ew.); or as an interruption of Micah's utterance by the false prophets themselves (so *e. g.* Kl., Ro., Or.). But against all three alternatives lies the fatal objection that these verses presuppose the exile as a matter of fact—whereas the popular prophets never admitted the possibility of exile (*cf.* 3[11]). Furthermore, the content of the verses is thoroughly in keeping with the teachings of the true prophets of certain periods (*v. i.*). Another supposition is that, though belonging to Micah, the verses are out of their original connection; so *e. g.* Ry., Kö. *Einl.* 327, Dr.; Stei. who places them after 4[8]; Condamin, *RB.* 1902, who makes them foll. 4[7].

The evidence, however, seems convincing for the exilic or postexilic origin of 2[12. 13]. The total lack of connection and the presupposition of the exile and the dispersion; the lack of any moral or religious prerequisites on Israel's part to the restoration of Yahweh's favour; the use of 'remnant' to designate returning exiles (*cf.* Gie., *Beiträge z. Jesaia-Kritik*, 37 *ff.*); and the parall. in phraseology and conception to such late passages as Ho. 2[2] Is. 11[11 ff.] 52[12] Je. 31[8], all combine to mark the passage as late (so Sta. *ZAW.* I, 162 *f.*; Kue. *Einl.* II, 359 *f.*; Cor. 340; Che. in WRS. *Proph.*[2], XXIII; We.; Now.; Grimm, *Lit. App.*; Marti; Siev.). Possibly these verses have displaced a more severe ending for the chapter, with which the ואמר of 3[1] originally made good connection (so Kue., Now., Grimm).

12. אאסף] 𝔊 *shall be gathered*, perhaps a free rendering (Ry.).—יעקב] 𝔗 = ישראל. 𝔖 *this people.*—כלך] Rd., with We., כֻּלּוֹ; so Now., Oort$^{Em.}$, Marti, Hal., Siev., Gu.; *cf.* 𝔊 *σὺν πᾶσιν.*—אשימנו] 𝔊 adds as obj., *τὴν ἀποστροφὴν αὐτοῦ* (*cf.* 𝔗's similar addition with אקבץ); hence Taylor would insert שְׁבִיתִי.—בצרה] Rd., with Wetzstein (in De. *Jesaia*[3], 705) בַּצִּירָה; so Now., Oort$^{Em.}$, Marti, Siev., Gu., *HWB.*[15]; *cf.* 𝔙 *in ovili.* Σ Θ *ἐν ὀχυρώματι.* 𝔊 *ἐν θλίψει* = בְּצָרָה (so 𝔖); so Dathe, Taylor, van H.. Hal. בְּנָוֹת. Hpt. בְּבָצְרָה. Against the reading בצירה, Hpt. makes the point that we should hardly expect צירה here, when the equivalent form טירה occurs in Gn. 25[16] Nu. 31[10] Ez. 25[4] Ps. 69[26] 1 Ch. 6[39]; but *cf.* the equivalent forms נצר and נטר.—הדברו] Rd., with Ro., הַדֹּבֶר, carrying ו over to foll. word; so Ry., SS., Elh., Pont, Gu., Now., Oort$^{Em.}$, Marti, Siev., Hpt.. 𝔊 *their lair.* 𝔙 *caularum.* Σ Θ *τῆς ἐρήμου*; hence Gr., Hal. מִדְבָּרוֹ. Van H. הַדֹּבֶר.—תהימנה] Rd. וְתֶהֱמֶינָה; so We., Gr., Now., Oort$^{Em.}$, Marti, Hal., Gu.. 𝔊 *they shall escape.* 𝔖 *is concealed.* Van H. יִתְמְהוּ וְנָדוּ.—מארם] Van H. מֵאָדָם.—**13.** עלה הפרץ] 𝔊 *διὰ τῆς διακοπῆς* = עַל הַפֶּרֶץ.—פרצו] 𝔖 sg.. 𝔄 omits with remainder of the verse.—ויעברו] Om. as dittog. from foll. line; it is tautologous between פרצו and ויצאו, and likewise superfluous in the metre.—שער] 𝔖 om..

12. *Jacob, all of him . . . the remnant of Israel*] By these two terms the whole of the Hebrew people is embraced, the latter phrase probably referring to the survivors of the northern kingdom. The exile and dispersion are here treated not as possibilities, but as actually existing facts. Passages like this and 4^{1-7}, written in periods when everything visible to the human eye was fraught with discouragement and gloom, reveal the extraordinary capacity of the Hebrew soul for faith—faith in its God and in its destiny. The pronoun of the 2d person, as in 𝔐, must give place to that of the 3d person (*v. s.*), in view of the parallel pronouns of the remainder of the poem. It is impossible to find anything but words of encouragement and comfort here.*—*Together will I put them like a flock in the fold*] 'Put together' is here synonymous with the preceding 'assemble' and 'gather.' It refers not only to the two halves of the nation heretofore separated but also to the more or less widely scattered groups of exiles in various lands. The 'diaspora' began early, as is demonstrated by the existence of a Jewish colony at Assuan on the Nile at least as early as 550 B.C..† RV.'s *sheep of Bozrah* yields no satisfactory sense; nor is it safe to render 'flock of the fold,' for *bŏtsrah* does not have the meaning 'fold' elsewhere, cannot be assigned to any root which yields such a sense, and lacks the preposition 'in' which the parallelism seems to require. It is therefore necessary to adopt a slightly different reading from 𝔐; *v. s.*.—*Like a herd in the midst of the pasture*] The similes employed imply not merely the bringing together of Israel from its different places of exile, but also the thought of Yahweh's protecting care after the return; *cf.* Ps. 23^1.—*And they will be tumultuous with people*] These two words are a later expansion as shown by the looseness of their connection, by the difficulty of the grammar, and by their redundance in the metre.‡ The subject apparently is the 'fold' and the 'pasture.' For the figure in the Hebrew, literally 'they will roar on account of men,' as designating great masses of people, *cf.* Is. 17^{12}.—**13.** *The breaker will go forth before them*] The figure of the flock and herd is still retained, but the scene now shifts from Palestine as the fold and pasture to the land of exile as a prison. Thence will Yahweh lead them forth, going before them like the ram of the flock to break down every barrier and remove every obstacle. That Yahweh is the 'breaker' is shown by the parallel terms in lines 7 and 8, which seem fatal objections to any attempt to identify the 'breaker' with some particular part of the Israelitish army after the analogy of 1 S. 13^{17} Ju. $20^{36 f.}$ Jos. $6^{7.\ 9.\ 13}$.* The same verb is used to describe Yahweh's activity in Ex. $19^{22.\ 24}$ 2 S. 5^{20} 1 Ch. 14^{11} Ps. 80^{13}.—*They will break through the gate and go forth thereat*] The words 'and pass on' which 𝔐 presents immediately after 'break through' are redundant and render the following 'go forth' belated and superfluous. Furthermore, the rendering 'pass on to the gate' (so RV.) leaves the preceding verb without an object, while the sense 'pass through' is difficult without a preposition. When to these difficulties is added the metrical redundance, it seems necessary to relegate the phrase to the margin.—*And their king will pass on before them, Yea—Yahweh at their head*] The 'king' and Yahweh are here identical, as in Je. 22^{2} Zp. 3^{15} Is. 33^{22} 41^{21} 43^{15} 44^{6} Ps. 89^{18}. To interpret 'king' as designating the Messianic ruler or the exiled monarch would involve a double headship and leadership of the returning procession such as finds no parallel elsewhere in the Old Testament. For other pictures of similar tone, *cf.* Je. $31^{9 f.}$ Is. $40^{1 f.}$ 52^{12}.

---

* *Contra* van H. (*v. s.*), who finds it necessary to eliminate lines 1, 2 and 8 as glosses made by one who misunderstood the tenor of the passage.

† *V.* JMPS. in *Biblical World*, XXXI (1908), 448 *ff.*.

‡ So also Siev., though working upon a different metrical basis.

12. כֻּלָּךְ] For this use of כל, *cf.* on 1^{2}.—שארית] Found prior to Isaiah and Micah only in Gn. 45^{7} (E), 2 S. 14^{7} Am. 1^{8} 5^{15}, *i. e.* twice in the sense of posterity, once of the few surviving Philistines, and once of decimated Israel. Isaiah is the first to introduce the thought of a holy remnant and to apply it to returning exiles; *cf.* Meinhold, *Der heilige Rest* (1903).—בצרה] Ordinarily taken as from בצר, *be inaccessible* (common to Heb. and Ar.) and given the meaning *fold; v. s.*. The reading בַּצִּרָה is supported in part by 𝔊 𝔖 and furnishes a good parallel to בתוך. The noun צִירָה is a by-form of טִירָה, corresponding to the Ar. *ṣîra*, and applied in Heb., Ar. and Syr. to the low stone wall surrounding an encampment, or to the encampment itself, or to a sheepfold similarly protected.—הדברו] For other cases of art. with sf., *cf.* Ges. $^{\S\,127\,i}$; Kö. $^{\S\,303\,e}$.—תהימנה] 𝔐 derives this from הום, but the existence of the Hiph. of this vb. is doubtful; the derivation from המה (*v. s.*) is better. The fem. pl. because the subjects צִירָה and דֹּבֶר represent *things*.—**13.** עָלָה] Proph. pf.; often used of return from exile, *e. g.* Ho. 1^{11} 2^{15} Is. 11^{16}; *cf.* Na. 2^{1}.—ויצאו] On proph. pf. continued by waw consec. with impf., *cf.* Kö. $^{\S\,147}$; Dr. $^{\S\,81}$.

---

* *Contra* Dr. *Exp.* 1887, pp. 259 *f.*.

§ 6. *Denunciation of the Leaders and Prophets* (3^{1-8}).

Of the seven four-line strs. constituting this poem, three are devoted to the secular leaders, three to the religious, and the last to Micah himself.

Str. I charges the leaders of Israel with having perverted their calling—they who should love and honour justice are devoted to the pursuit of wickedness. **Str. II** in highly figurative language pictures their oppression of the poor and helpless. **Str. III** announces a day of disaster when these leaders will reap the due reward of their deeds and find that Yahweh turns a deaf ear to their cry for help in their distress. **Str. IV** turns the charge against the prophets of the day who being actuated by mercenary motives are leading Israel astray. **Str. V,** under the figure of an eclipse, declares the time to be at hand when the impotence of these prophets will become manifest—prophets without vision. **Str. VI** describes the shame and confusion that will overwhelm them when they discover that God heeds not their cry. **Str. VII** sets forth, in sharp contrast to the powerlessness just described, Micah's consciousness of his own authority and power to denounce the sins of Israel.

HEAR now, ye heads of Jacob,
And rulers of the house of Israel:
Is it not yours to know justice,
Ye who hate good and love evil?
BUT they eat the flesh of my people,
And their skin from upon them they strip off;
And their bones they lay bare and break them up,
Like meat in the pot, and flesh within the caldron.
THEN will they cry unto Yahweh,
And he will not answer them;
But will hide his face from them,
Inasmuch as they have made their deeds evil.
[Thus has Yahweh said:]
CONCERNING the prophets who lead my people astray,
Who when they bite with their teeth preach peace;
But as for him who puts not into their mouths—
Against him they declare war.
THEREFORE, it will be night for you without vision,
And darkness for you without divination.
Yea, the sun will set upon those prophets,
And the day will become dark over them.

AND the seers will be ashamed,
And the diviners will blush,
And they will cover the upper lip, all of them,
Because there is no answer from God.
BUT I, indeed, am full of power,
And justice and strength,
To declare to Jacob his transgression,
And to Israel his sin.

The symmetry of the poem is apparent. In both groups of three strs. each, the opening str. contains the address and the general charge, the 2d str. presents a series of bold figures, and the closing str. declares the same climax—Yahweh's refusal to hear the cry of the wicked. Furthermore, Strs. III and VI alike are made up of short trenchant lines, announcements of doom which fall like the blows of a sledge-hammer. This arrangement presupposes the omission of v. [2b. c] as a variant of v. [3] (so We., Now., Marti, Gu.; *cf.* Löhr, *ZDMG.* LXI, 3–6); the treatment of בעת ההיא in v. [4c] as a repetition of אז in v. [4a] (so Marti, Siev.); the excision of את רוח יהוה from v. [8] as a gloss (so We., Now., Marti, Siev., Gu., Du.); and the exclusion of the introductory formulas in vv. [1-5] as extraneous to the poetic form.

Löhr and Siev. agree in excluding vv. [5-8] from this piece and including vv. [9-12], but this fails to do justice to the symmetrical relations between vv. [1-4] and [5-8] on the one hand, and the logical and formal independence of vv. [9-12] on the other. Furthermore, their metrical arrangement (Löhr, 4+3+3; Siev. 7+3) takes too great liberties with the text, removing no less than twenty-five words from the 𝕸 of vv. [1-8], *i. e.* nearly one-fourth of the material, and adding two words at the opening of v. [5].

1. ואמר] 𝕲 𝕾 = וְאָמַר; We., Marti, Gu., Hpt. om. as gloss; so 𝕷, unless *in tempore* at the close of 2^{13} represents it.—שמעו־נא] 𝕲 𝕾 add זאת, as in v. [9].—יעקב] 𝕲 𝕾 𝕿 and 12 codd. of Kenn. and de R., בית י׳, as in v. [9]; so Hal..—קציני] 𝕲 *οἱ κατάλοιποι*; so also in v. [9].—**2.** רעה] Rd. רָע, with Qr..—עורם] Gr. עִיר עַמִּי.—מעליהם] Hal. מֵעַל יְתֹמִים.—עצמותם] Hal. אלמנות.—**3.** ואשר] 𝕲 *ὃν τρόπον.* 𝕾 𝖁 om. ו. Taylor, וּשְׁאֵר.—מעליהם] 𝕲^AQ^ *ἀπὸ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτῶν.*—ופרשו] 𝕲 *καὶ ἐμέλισαν*; so 𝖁. 𝕾 *they throw into.*—כאשר] Rd. כִּשְׁאֵר, with 𝕲 *ὡς σάρκας*; so Döderlein, Dathe, Bauer, Jus., Ro., Stek., Taylor, Elh., We., Pont, Gr., Gu., Now., Oort^Em.^, Marti, Löhr, Siev., van H., Du., Hpt.. Now., slavishly foll. by Marti, cites 𝕾 in support of this reading, but 𝕾 reproduces 𝕸 literally. Hal. מִשְּׁאֵר.—**4.** אז] 𝕲 *οὕτως.* Löhr om. as gloss, but inserts here, partly from v. [3] יִפְרְשׂוּ כַּפֵּיהֶם; *cf.* Siev..—ויסתר] Marti, וְיַסְתֵּר.—כאשר] 𝕲 *ἀνθ' ὧν*; so 𝕾.—הרעו וגו׳] 𝕲 freely, *they have dealt wickedly in their practices against themselves;* similarly 𝖁.—**5.** וקדשו] 𝕲 *ἤγειραν*, a free rendering, corrected by several codd. to *ἡγίασαν.*—עליו] Siev. om. *metri causa*, as in 𝕸 after קראו, where 𝕲 adds it.—**6.** לכן לילה] We. and Now.

insert יִהְיֶה; *cf.* 𝔊.—וחשכה] Rd., with Hartmann, וַחֲשֵׁכָה; so Ry., Or., Taylor, SS., Elh., We., Pont, Gr., Now., Marti, Hal., van H., Hpt., Du.. Gu., וְחָשַׁךְ. 𝔖 treats as a verbal form.—מקסם] *HWB.*^{15}, Marti, Hpt., Du., מִקְּסֹם, for sake of parallelism with חזון; but the rhyme supports 𝔐.—**7.** ועטו על שפם] 𝔊 *καὶ καταλαλήσουσιν κατ' αὐτῶν*, not a free rendering (*contra* Taylor), but a mere guess. *Cf.* Schnurrer, Vol., Ry.. In Ez. $24^{17.\ 22}$ where this phrase occurs, 𝔊 renders 'ע by *παρακαλέω*; in Lv. 13^{45}, by *περιβαλέσθω*. Stek. therefore suggests that 𝔊 derived it from עיט; but where עיט does appear in 𝔐, 𝔊 failed to recognise it, rendering it by *κλίνω* in 1 S. 14^{32} 25^{14}, by *ὥρμησας τοῦ θέσθαι* in 1 S. 15^{19}, and by *διαμασᾶσθαι* in BS. 34^{16}. 𝔖 renders 'ש as if from שָׂפָה, *lip*.—מענה] Some Heb codd. מַעֲנֶה; so 𝔊 𝔖.—אלהים] 𝔊 *αὐτῶν* = אֲלֵיהֶם; 𝔖 = אלהים אליהם.—**8.** ואולם] 𝔊 *ἐὰν μὴ* = אוּלַי. Θ *ἐκωλύθη*. Several codd. of 𝔊 read *ἀλλὰ μήν* = 𝔐.—מלאתי] 𝔊 *ἐμπλήσω*; some codd. *ἐνεπλήσθην*.—כח את רוח יהוה] Om. as gloss, את ר' י', with We., Now., Marti, Siev., Du., Hpt.. Gie. *Berufsbegabung*, 123, om. כח את. Oort$^{\text{Em}}$., כח ברוח י'.—ומשפט וגבורה] 𝔄 om.; so cod. Reuch. of 𝔗; so Taylor, Pont, Siev.. Chrysostom om. ומשפט.—ולישראל] Two mss. of 𝔊 = ולבית יש'.

Str. I charges the rulers of Israel with having grossly betrayed the trust reposed in them,—the guardians of justice have become abettors of and participants in crime.—**1.** *But I said*] No satisfactory connection of this phrase with anything preceding can be found. After the removal of the interpolation $2^{12.\ 13}$, with which it has no point of contact, and of 2^{11} (*v. s.*), connection might be made with 2^{10} by rendering, 'Furthermore, I said'; but a particle would be expected to express such an idea, and it presupposes a close integration of thought between 2^{10} and $3^{1\text{ ff.}}$ which does not exist. Rather does a new theme present itself in ch. 3. It may be that some connecting link between 2^{10} and 3^{1} has been lost; otherwise, this phrase must be regarded as an obscure marginal note.—*Heads of Jacob and rulers of the house of Israel*] The identical terminology in v. ^{9}, with the specifications in v. ^{10}, makes it clear that the address both here and there is to the officials of Judah in general and Jerusalem in particular.—*Know justice*] *Cf.* Am. 3^{10}. The knowledge required is not mere intellectual appreciation of the principles of justice, but a practical understanding of its obligations and a sympathy with its aims which will lead to a righteous administration of law.—**2.** *Ye who hate good, etc.*] Their conduct is, for Micah, susceptible of no other explanation.—*Ye who* *pluck their skin from upon them and their flesh from upon their bones*] A gloss as is shown by the lack of any antecedents for the pronouns, and by its substantial identity of contents with v. [3].

Str. II is marked by the transfer to the 3d person from the 2d person of direct address in **Str. I**, and by the contrast the picture of the actual conduct of the rulers affords to the ideal suggested for them in **Str. I.**—**3.** *But they eat the flesh of my people*] The people are in Micah's eyes like a defenceless flock at the mercy of wild beasts; the watch-dogs who should protect the flock have pounced upon them like ravening wolves. Micah's passionate sympathy with his countrymen is reflected in the pronoun "my."—*And their skin from upon them they strip off and lay bare their bones*] The figures here employed suggest the violence and lawlessness of the processes whereby the very life was crushed out of the small landowners.—*And break them up like meat in the pot and flesh within the caldron*] These words are omitted by some scholars as an editorial expansion of the preceding figure.* Similes or comparisons are not common in Mi. 1–3, it is true, though they are not wholly lacking ($1^{8.\,16}$ 3^{4}); nor is the adjustment to the metre here the most easy; while the verbs 'lay bare' and 'break' have different objects, the latter referring to the fellow-citizens of Micah. But all this is not conclusive of secondary origin. Micah, quite as well as a later reader, could carry his figure through to the very end. The devastation of the poor is total and irreparable.†

Str. III announces the coming of a day when Yahweh will ignore the cry of these oppressors now brought low, because they have ignored his call to righteousness and justice.—**4.** *Then will they cry*] A reference to the coming judgment spoken of in $2^{3.\,4.\,10}$; *cf.* the similar use of 'now' as = 'then' in Am. 6^{7} Ho. 2^{12}.—*And he will not answer them*] For the converse of this attitude, *cf.* Ps. 34^{15}.—*But will hide his face from them*] That he may not be moved to pity by the sight of their distress. A common figure for the divine displeasure; *cf.* Is. 1^{15} 8^{17} Dt. $31^{17.\ 18}$ 32^{20} Jb. 13^{24} Ps. 13^{1}.—*At that time*] A gloss, as shown by the metre,* intended to define more closely the application of 'then' in line 1; *cf.* 2^{3}.—*Inasmuch as they have made their deeds evil*] A pregnant use of כאשר, implying a comparison; the wicked conduct of the rich is clear evidence that they have turned a deaf ear to the call of Yahweh through his prophets; Yahweh now treats them in like manner.†

---

* So We., Now., Marti, Löhr, Siev., Gu..

† If the language of Micah be thought stronger than the facts warranted, attention need only be called to the atrocities perpetrated upon the peasants of Germany in a supposedly more civilised age, which resulted in the outbreak of the Peasants' War; and that too with the support of the laws. See Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, VI, 440 *ff.*; Newman, *Manual of Church History*, II, 69 *ff.*; Zimmermann, *Allgemeine Geschichte des grossen Bauernkriegs* (1854).

Str. IV turns to another class of offenders, the popular prophets, whom Micah charges with base subservience to selfish ends.—**5.** *Thus has Yahweh said*] This phrase, stating the divine authority of the message about to be uttered, lies outside of the movement of the poem; *cf.* Am. 1^{8e} 2^{16b} 3^{15b} 4^{3} 8^{9a}.—*Concerning the prophets who lead my people astray*] The prophets here denounced are the members of the prophetic guilds (see H.^{AH}, xlix–lviii), the best of whom were victims of a too narrow patriotism and a low idea of God. Micah, with the undiscriminating passion of indignation, treats them all alike as swayed by unworthy motives. The cleft between the lower and the higher types of prophecy began at least as early as the days of Micaiah ben Imlah (1 K. 22) and grew wider with each succeeding generation; *cf.* 3^{11} Am. 7^{12} Is. 9^{15} Je. 28. But the true prophet, in the face of opposition and isolation, remained certain that he only was the interpreter of the will of God.—*Who when they bite with their teeth preach peace*] Not in the sense that they hypocritically proclaim prosperity though conscious that they are all the time injuring the people;‡ but, as is shown by the following lines, that their good will is conditioned upon their being well fed.§ For a later estimate of the value and authenticity of prophecies of prosperity, see Je. $28^{8.\ 9}$.—*But if one puts not into their mouths they declare war against him*] It seems less likely that prediction of national war is meant by this,** than that these mercenary prophets levy a tyrannical species of blackmail upon their constituents. The man who will not contribute to their support is subjected to slander and abuse of various kinds. They represent it to be Yahweh's will that such men be treated as his enemies. The verb rendered 'declare' literally means 'sanctify,' 'consecrate,' and has reference to the religious ceremonies always associated with the actual commencement of hostilities; *cf.* 1 S. 13^{8-12} Je. 6^4 Is. 13^3 Jo. 4^9 Dt. 20^2.* Prophets who thus brought their high calling into disgrace for the furtherance of their own selfish ends seem never to have been lacking, from the earliest times (*cf.* Am. 7^{12}) even down to the days of the early Christian church.†

---

* So Marti, Now.^{K}, Löhr, Siev., Gu., Du.; so also in Am. 5^{13}

† Gu. suspects this clause to be a later addition; but the only ground urged is its prosaic character. May not a prophet descend to prose occasionally? Homer sometimes nods.

‡ So Casp..

§ For a similar indignant charge made by the Greek tragic poets against venal soothsayers, *v.* Sophocles, ***Antigone***, 1036, Æschylus, ***Agamemnon***, 1168.

** We., Van H..

Str. V, under the figure of an eclipse, represents the spiritual darkness into which the prophets will be plunged on the approaching day of doom which they have been preparing for themselves. —**6.** *Therefore, it will be night for you without vision*] This is not merely a figurative way of saying that the power of prophetic insight and foresight will soon be withdrawn from those who have abused such gifts, but rather a description of the great day of Yahweh (*cf.* Am. 5^{18}), which awaits the whole nation. The sins of the leaders involve the entire people in suffering. The calamities of that day will stagger the shallow optimism of the prophets who would heal Israel's wounds lightly. They will have no message for such times.—*And darkness for you without divination*] The verb 'to divine' is never used of legitimate prophetic activity, but always of the arts of magic, soothsaying, necromancy, and the like.—*Yea, the sun will set, etc.*] The second half of the str. repeats and so emphasises the thought of the first half.

Str. VI describes the shame and confusion that will enshroud the pseudo-prophets when in the light of the events of the day of Yahweh their prophecies are seen to be lies and they find themselves utterly unable to read the will of God.—**7.** *And the seers will be ashamed, and the diviners will blush*] The terms 'seer' and 'diviner' are suggested by the opening lines of **Str. V.**—*And they will*

---

* *V.* Schwally, F., *Semitische Kriegsaltertümer*, I. *Der heilige Krieg im alten Israel* (1901).

† *Cf. Didache*, XI, 3–6:—"Now concerning apostles and prophets and the teaching of the gospel, so do ye: every apostle that comes to you, receive him as the Lord. But he shall remain only one day; if there be need, however, a second also. But if he remain three days, he is a false prophet. And when a prophet sets forth, let him take nothing except bread until he may find a lodging; if he ask for money, he is a false prophet."

cover the upper lip, all of them] A common sign of mourning; *cf.* Ez. $24^{17.\ 22}$ Lv. 13^{45}. The origin of this veiling of the lip and mouth in mourning is variously explained; by some, as a substitute for an older custom of shaving off the beard as a hair-offering to the departed spirit; by others, as a method of disguise adopted to protect the survivors from recognition and injury at the hands of the departed; by others, as a method of blocking the mouth against the entrance of malicious spirits; by still others, as a device to discourage conversation so that the mourner might be undisturbed in his grief. Its original significance, however, had probably long been forgotten by Micah's day.—*Because there is no answer from God*] Not that all this has come about because their oracles had been of their own concoction, and not of divine origin;* but rather that in the approaching day, Yahweh will refuse to reveal his will to them.

In **Str. VII** Micah unhesitatingly declares his consciousness of possessing the indispensable equipment for the prophetic office which his opponents lack; hence his message is of a totally different character from theirs.—**8.** *But I, indeed, am full of power*] In contrast with the vacillating pseudo-prophets who are swayed to and fro by every wave of public opinion, the true prophet forges straight ahead in the line of Yahweh's will which often compels him to defy the popular will. Micah knows he has strength sufficient for all his needs.—*The spirit of Yahweh*] A prosaic gloss by some editor who deemed it necessary to indicate the source of Micah's power. Its extraneous character is shown by the fact that it alone of the four attributes is accompanied by את, by its unnatural position in the series of four, and by its violation of the metrical movement.—*And justice and strength*] The time-serving prophets are filled with and inspired by the people's gifts; Micah's inspiration and satisfaction come from his God-given sense of right and his energy in the enforcement of righteousness upon his contemporaries.—*To declare to Jacob his transgression and to Israel his sin*] This was the task to which Micah and all true prophets felt themselves called, to denounce and expose sin and to hold up in contrast with it higher conceptions of God and duty.—This str. furnishes a hint as to the psychology of prophecy. The truths enunciated by the prophet were not things imposed upon him from without, but the choicest possessions of his own inner spirit, the product of his own divinely illuminated experience, observation, and meditation upon the practical problems of life.

---

* So Ro., Ry..

1. Obligatory idea lies in הלוא לכם] Kö.$^{\S 397 d}$; not in לדעת] Ges.$^{\S 114 l}$; Dr.$^{\S 204 n}$. On force of the rhetorical question, *cf.* Ges.$^{\S 150 e}$.—**2.** רעה] Qr. רָע is supported by the balance it furnishes for the monosyl. טוב, and the fact that טוב and רע accompany each other just as regularly as טובה and רעה; *v.* Ps. 52^{5} 38^{21} 35^{12} Pr. 16^{30} Nu. 24^{13}.—**3.** פצחו] ἁπ; not from فضخ, *to break* (so BDB. and *HWB.*^{15}), but from فضح, *to lay bare* (so Bevan, cited by Marti), ordinarily used in Ar. to denote the exposure of vices or faults; *v.* Lane, *Lex.* 2410.—ופרשו] = *and spread out*, which does not suit the following similes; it is better taken as a by-form of פרס, used in Qal of the breaking of bread and in Hiph. of the dividing of the hoofs of animals; *cf.* Nö. *ZA.* I, 417 *f.*. The sequence of tenses here demands וַיִּפ'.—כבשר] On absence of article, *cf.* Kö.$^{\S 299 l}$.—קלחת] Only here and 1 S. 2^{14}, but context in both cases renders its general sense quite clear; *cf.* Lagarde, *Übersicht*, 88; Erman, *ZDMG.* XLVI, 121.—**4.** ויסתר] The jussive, as in 𝔐, is without any of its characteristic force here; it is most easily accounted for as a case of defective writing of the normal indicative form, Dr.$^{\S 174}$; but *cf.* Kö.$^{\S 192 d}$, which attributes ē to "the vowel-oppressing influence of the consonantal environment"; Ges.$^{\S 109 k}$, which explains forms of this kind as often caused by necessities of rhythm; and Hpt. who calls it an Aramaicism.—כאשר] For similar usage, *cf.* Ju. 6^{27} 1 S. 28^{18} Nu. 27^{14} 2 K. 17^{26}; *v.* Kö.$^{\S 389 z}$.—**5.** הנשכים] Serving as the protasis of a condition, Ges.$^{\S 116 w}$.—**6.** וחשכה] On 3d pers. sg. fem., as in 𝔐, used for natural phenomena, *cf.* Ges.$^{\S 144 c}$; Kö.$^{\S 323 k}$. But the parallelism demands a noun.—**7.** שפם] Lit. = *mustache; cf.* 2 S. 19^{25} (𝔊 *μύσταξ*); on root, *cf.* Barth, *ZDMG.* XLI, 633 and Jensen, *ZA.* VII, 218.—**8.** את רוח יהוה] On function of את here, *cf.* Kö.$^{\S 288 o}$. The 'thing with which' is usually found in the acc. after מלא, when used in the Qal, and without the sign of the acc. even when the noun is defined; *e. g.* Dt. 34^{9} Jb. 20^{11}; but cases with את, as here, are not wanting, *e. g.* Ex. 8^{17} Ez. 10^{4}. Less likely does את have prepositional force 'with,' 'by,' 'through,' as perhaps in Gn. 4^{1}.

§ 7. *The Doom of Israel* (3^{9-12}).

This is the climax of Micah's utterances. He here groups together the three leading classes in Judah, the princes, priests and prophets, and lays upon them the full responsibility for the approaching downfall of the capital city which he foretells.

Str. I repeats the address and the charge with which the preceding oracle opened, but adds to them a further specific accusation to the effect that Judah's rulers have tried to establish the prosperity of Jerusalem upon the basis of oppression and murder. **Str. II** declares that princes, priests and prophets alike have all used their offices for their own enrichment through the encouragement of bribery and fraud, and exposes the fallacy and fatuity of their reliance upon the favour of Yahweh for protection from all harm. **Str. III** pronounces sentence: because of their evil deeds Jerusalem will be totally destroyed and become a waste and desolation.

HEAR this, now, ye heads of the house of Jacob,
And rulers of the house of Israel;
Who abhor justice,
And pervert all that is right;
Who build Zion with blood,
And Jerusalem with iniquity.
HER chiefs judge for a bribe,
And her priests give oracles for hire,
And her prophets divine for money;
Yet upon Yahweh they lean, saying,
"Is not Yahweh in the midst of us?
No evil can befall us."
THEREFORE, on account of you,
Zion will be ploughed as a field,
And Jerusalem will become ruins,
And the mountain of the house a high-place in a forest.

This is the first departure in the genuine material of Micah from the norm of the four-line str.. Du. (*EB.* 3800) and Marti organise such strs. here; but to do so is to violate the logical connection. בני of v. [10] is a continuation of the direct address employed in v. [9], while v. [11] passes over into the 3d pers.. The three classes mentioned in v. [11] belong together in one str., being all charged with the same crime; princes, priests and prophets form the great triumvirate of transgressors from which the prophets may not be segregated. Löhr and Siev. in their attempts to carry through a 4+3+3 or 7+3 movement do great violence to the text Both omit lines 1–3 of Str. II, simply because of the 3+3+3 movement there found (so also Gu., who urges the change of person as interrupting connection between v. ^{10} and v. ^{11d}); likewise לכן from the opening of Str. III. Not only so but Löhr finds it necessary to invent an additional word in each of three lines in vv. $^{9. 10}$ for the sake of the metre, while Siev. accomplishes the same end by repeating ^{10} after ^{9b} and transposing ^{9d} to follow ^{10b}. All this seems arbitrary and superfluous in a text that reads as smoothly as 𝕸 does here.

9. זאת] Om. by Marti, Löhr, Siev., Hpt., Du.; *cf.* v. ^{1}.—בית] Om. by We., Marti, Löhr., Siev., Du., Hpt.; *cf.* v. ^{1}.—יש׳ . . . יעקב] Interchanged by 𝕲^{A}.—וקציני] 𝕲 as in v. ^{1}.—הישרה] 𝕲 𝕾 𝖁 𝕿 pl..—**10.** בנה] Rd. בֹּנֵי, with 𝕲 *οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες*; so 𝕾 𝖁 𝕿 and We., Gr., Oort$^{Em.}$, Now., Du., Marti, Hal., Löhr, Siev., van H., Gu..—**11.** ישפטו] 𝕲 𝖁 pl..—יורו] Aq. Θ *ἐφώτιζον*, probably connecting it with אור. 𝕲 *ἀπεκρίνοντο*.—**12.** שדה] Oort$^{Em.}$ כשדה.—עיין] Rd. עיים, as in Je. 26^{18}; so 8 codd. of Kenn. and 4 of de R., We., Now., Marti, Hal., Siev., Gu., Hpt., Du..—בית] 𝖁 *templi; cf.* 𝕿.—לבמות] Rd. לְבָמָה, with Σ *εἰς ὕψος* and Θ *εἰς βουνόν*; so We., Now., Oort$^{Em.}$, Du., Marti, Hal., Gu.. 𝕲 has *εἰς ἄλσος*, *a grove* (so also in Je. 26^{18}; elsewhere it represents אשרה); *cf.* 𝕾 ܠܒܝܬ ܥܒܐ, *a wooded region*, which does not necessarily presuppose a reading בית, but is better explained as due to the influence of 𝕲. The use of the sg. in 𝕲 is not conclusive in itself, since 𝕲's renderings of במה are so varied in character (at least thirteen different ones in the OT.) and relatively heedless of number; *cf. e. g.* 1 Ch. 21^{29} Dt. 32^{13} Nu. 22^{41} Is. 14^{14} 15^{2} 16^{12} Je. 7^{31}. Σ on the other hand, so far as it can be tested, is faithful to the form of its original in its treatment of this word (*e. g.* 2 S. 1^{19} 1 K. 12^{32} 13^{33} 15^{14} 2 K. $17^{9. 32}$ $23^{5. 20}$).

Str. I charges the leaders of Judah with betraying the trust reposed in them as the guardians of truth and justice. Lines 1 and 2 are a verbal repetition of the corresponding lines in **Str. I** of the previous section; 3 and 4 are a paraphrase of the latter half of the same str.; while 5 and 6 add a new figure.—**9.** *And pervert all that is right*] Lit. 'twist all that is straight'; apparently by insolent defiance of law rather than by jesuitical interpretation thereof. *Cf.* Is. 5^{20}.—**10.** *Who build Zion with blood and Jerusalem with iniquity*] The prophet denounces a material prosperity which is based upon the spoliation of the poor and the confiscation of the property of the innocent condemned to death; *cf.* 1 K. 21 Am. 5^{11} Ho. 4^{2} Is. 1^{15} Je. 22^{13} Ez. 22^{27}.

Str. II first brings an accusation of bribery against all the leading officials of government, civil and religious; then contrasts with their depraved moral state their false security in Yahweh's protecting presence and power. **11.** *Her chiefs judge for a bribe*] Judicial functions were exercised by the highest officials; *cf.* 2 S. 15^{2-6}. Bribery has always been one of the most prevalent vices of oriental government; every official has his price;* *cf.* 7^{3} Is. 1^{23} 5^{23}. In such a system the poor man has no chance.—*And her priests give oracles for hire*] The only allusion to priests in the book of Micah; *cf.* Ho. 6^{9} 10^{5} Is. 28^{7}. The most difficult cases were brought to the priests that they might obtain the judgment of Yahweh upon them; *cf.* Ex. $18^{19\text{ ff.}}$ Is. 28^{7} Dt. $17^{8.\,9}$ 21^{5}. Similar usage still exists among the Bedouin. The prophet thus makes the terrible accusation that the priests manipulate the oracle in such cases in the interest of the rich and powerful and to their own enrichment.—*And her prophets divine for money*] *Cf.* note on v. ^{5}. It is not merely that pay, even when offered and received with the purest of motives, is a constant menace to the absolute independence and freedom of thought and speech without which true prophecy cannot live; but these soothsaying diviners have deliberately sold themselves to the highest bidders. All three of the influential classes are money-mad.—*Yet, upon Yahweh they lean, saying*] These men are not Godless miscreants; on the contrary, they wear the livery of religion and they congratulate themselves upon having the support of Yahweh.—*Is not Yahweh in the midst of us? No disaster can befall us*] *Cf.* Am. 3^{2}. This was the crux of the conflict between the prophetic and the popular conceptions of God. This conviction on the part of the people in general made the preaching of Amos, Hosea and Micah sound like treason and distrust of Yahweh. It is not improbable that the presence of the temple in Jerusalem as the headquarters of Yahweh gave added strength to this popular belief; *cf.* Je. 7^{3-7}. The common conception of Yahweh was not yet informed with the ethical ideal. Performance of the ceremonial was thought to be the essence of religion; Yahweh cared for little more. Against this error, the prophets with one consent insisted that Yahweh's supreme interest was ethical, not ritualistic. His demand for righteousness was more insistent than his love for Israel. *Cf.* 6^{6-8} Is. 1^{10-17} Am. 5^{21-27} Ho. 6^{6}.

---

* Nö. *Sketches from Eastern History*, 133 *f.*; Doughty, *Arabia Deserta*, I, 607, II, 20; GASm. 398.

Str. III turns once more directly to the offenders, as in **Str. I**, and hurls upon them the responsibility for the impending ruin of Jerusalem.—**12.** *Therefore, on account of you*] The sense of individual responsibility for sin had not yet developed sufficiently to raise any question in the prophet's mind as to the justice of destroying a whole city for the sins of the leading citizens. But even so, the sins of the populace at large cried out for judgment with no uncertain sound. Micah does but fix the responsibility for leading the way in sin and thereby bring home guilt to the consciences of those in power.—*Zion will be ploughed as a field*] A figure for total destruction; *cf.* Ps. 129^{3}. Zion was the name of the Jebusite stronghold captured by David (2 S. 5^{6-9}). This was probably located on the southern slope of the hill to the east of the Tyropœan Valley. But the name soon came to be applied to the entire city, in which sense it is employed here in parallelism with 'Jerusalem' and also in v. [10].—*And Jerusalem will become ruins*] Micah was the first prophet to threaten Judah with the annihilation of its capital; but he does so without a tremor. Jerusalem as the centre of corruption and pollution (1^{5}) must be cut out of the body politic, lest the entire nation become corrupt and perish. His heart goes out to the peasant farmers of the hillsides of Judah in passionate sympathy with them in their misery and wrong, but he can condemn their oppressors to death with unshaken voice.—*And the mountain of the house a wooded height*] The temple mount now thronged with worshippers will become a deserted hill-top like the summit of Mt. Carmel. This is the climax of the threat. That Yahweh would permit the destruction and desecration of his own chief shrine must have sounded like blasphemy to Micah's hearers. But it was the most stunning blow that could be dealt to the old conception of God. It shows also how thoroughly Micah was freed from slavery to rites and institutions. He had certainly learned that 'God dwelleth not in temples made with hands.'*

---

* On the significance of the citation of v. [12] in Je. 26^{18}, see Introduction.

9. יְעַקֵּשׁוּ] On force of impf. continuing a prtc., *cf.* Ges.$^{\S\,116\,x}$; on transition to 3d pers. after the vocative, *cf.* Kö.$^{\S\,344\,l.\,m}$.—**10.** בֹּנֶה] Is difficult of explanation either as a collective (van H.) or as applied to a typical individual of the class denounced. The reading בֹּנֵי is supported by the fact that the Vrss. all have the pl., by the close likeness to בֹּנֶה in form, by the parallel prtc. הַמְתַעֲבִים, and by the pl. form of יעקשו which it continues.—**11.** בִּמְחִיר] ב *pretii*, Kö.$^{\S\,332\,o}$.—יהוה בקרבנו] *Cf.* עִמָּנוּאֵל, Is. 7^{14}, and F. C. Porter, *JBL.* XIV (1895), 19–36.—**12.** שָׂדֶה] Acc. of effect or product, Ges.$^{\S\,121\,d}$; Kö.$^{\S\,338\,v}$.—עִיִּין] Aram. pl. due to a copyist; *cf.* Je 26^{18}; note the suggestion that the error was facilitated by the fact that ן was more easily articulated before the following ת (Ges.$^{\S\,44\,k}$).—לְבָמוֹת] Usual form of cstr. pl. is בָּמוֹתֵי, but *cf.* Nu. 21^{28} Ez. 36^{2} Ho. 10^{8}. The pl. is hardly appropriate as applied to the temple mount, and 𝔊 has sg. both here and in Je. 26^{18}. The meaning 'hill-top' gives a stronger contrast here than is afforded by 'high-place.'

B. CHAPTERS 4 AND 5.

Chs. 4 and 5 have given much trouble to interpreters, great variety of opinion existing as to what portions, if any, may be attributed to Micah and as to the origin and date of the portions not thus assigned. All agree, however, that the chapters as they now stand are wholly lacking in logical continuity within themselves and must be regarded as composed of a series of more or less unrelated fragments. By some, this lack of logical unity is urged, with other considerations, as warrant for denying these chapters to Micah, in whole or in part. By others, it is held to be consistent with Micah's authorship, either on the ground of the vivacity and mobility of his style, which is not to be confined within logical limits;* or because the spoken word permits of greater freedom from logical restraint than does the written word;† or on the hypothesis that the present order is due to the work of a redactor who arranged fragments of Micah's addresses in an order which is for us no order.‡

---

* So de Goeje, *ThT.* VI, 279–84; Kue. *ThT.* VI, 285–302.

† Kue., Wildeboer, GASm..

‡ Ry., Elh., Pont. For more detailed treatment of these questions, see the discussions of the individual sections, and the general Introduction, § 2.

§ 8. *An Ideal of Yahweh's World-Dominion* (4[1-5]).

Three six-line strs. in trimeter movement, with a later expansion (vv. [4. 5]), announcing the coming world-wide supremacy of Yahweh and the beneficent results involved therein. **Str. I** states the fact that the temple of Yahweh in Jerusalem is to become the religious rallying-point of the nations. **Str. II** indicates their motive in coming as the desire to learn of Yahweh's ways at the only source of instruction. **Str. III** declares that Yahweh will be the world's arbiter, and that the weapons and art of war will perish. The appendices add details to the picture of idyllic peace.

IT will come to pass in the issue of the days,
That the mountain of Yahweh's house will be
Established at the top of the mountains,
And it will be lifted up from the hills,
And peoples will flow unto it,
Yea, many nations will come, and say:
COME, let us go up to the mount of Yahweh,
And to the house of the God of Jacob;
That he may teach us of his ways,
So that we may walk in his paths.
For from Zion goeth forth instruction,
And the word of Yahweh from Jerusalem.
AND he will judge between many peoples,
And will arbitrate for strong nations,
And they will hammer their swords into ploughshares,
And their spears into pruning-hooks.
They will not lift up the sword, nation against nation,
Nor will they any longer learn war.

The progress of thought is clear in this poem, and points unmistakably to six-line (so Du.) rather than four-line (Marti) strs.. The direct discourse beginning in v. [2b] distinctly marks the point of departure for a new str. and so establishes the six-line norm. The arrangement of Siev. fails to discover any strophic formation and does violence to the parall., in addition to its omission of three lines from vv. [1. 2] solely on metrical grounds.

The original material ceases with v. [3]. Interpreters in general now concede the separation of v. [5]; so *e. g.* Cor., GASm., Now., Marti, Siev., Gu., Du.. It sustains no close relation to vv. [1-4]. Marti and Gu. also athetize v. [4c]; but in view of the absence of the whole verse from the parallel passage in Is. 2[2-4], and of the further fact that it is composed of stock phrases which add nothing essential to the description in vv. [1-3], it seems safe to assign all of v. ^{4} to editorial expansion; so Che. *Intr. to Is.*, on 2^{2-4}; Skipwith, *JQR.* VI, 23, 583 *ff.*; F. Ladame, *Revue de théologie et de philosophie*, 1902, pp. 446 *ff.*; Du.. The only change in 𝔐 of vv. $^{1-3}$ required by the metre is the omission of עַד רחוק from v. ^{3b}, as a gloss not present in Is. 2^{4}.

The repetition of these verses in Is. 2^{2-4} has occasioned much discussion as to their origin. Four views have found currency at various times:—(1) that the passage was original with Isaiah and borrowed from him by Micah (so *e. g.* De. on Is. 2^{2-4}; Ro., Kl., Cor. *ZAW.* IV, 88); (2) that it was original with Micah and borrowed by Isaiah or an editor of Isaiah (so *e. g.* Hartmann, Ke., WRS. in *Enc. Brit.* art. *Micah;* Ry.); (3) that it was an older oracle borrowed alike by Isaiah and Micah (so *e. g.* Ros., Mau., Ew., Hi., Reuss, Or.); (4) that it was a later interpolation both in Isaiah and Micah (so *e. g.* Sta. *ZAW.* I, 165 *ff.*; Kosters, *ThT.* 1893; Kue. *Einl.*; Che. *Intr. to Book of Isa.*, 9–16; Cor., We., Now., Marti, Gu., Du.). That it neither originated with Micah nor was incorporated by him from an earlier source seems certain. The transition from 3^{12} to 4^{1-4} is too abrupt; there Jerusalem lies waste, here it is the centre of pilgrimages from all parts of the world; not a word is spoken of the restoration of the city involved in the latter description. The spirit of 4^{1-4} is incompatible with that of 3^{9-12}; here Jerusalem is the nation's pride and glory, there the prophet's love centres in the country people while the city represents to him all that is bad. Je. 26^{18} tells against the early origin of this passage, for it is unlikely that such an impression of Micah's message would have existed in Hezekiah's time, if Micah had cancelled the effect of 3^{12} by the comforting words of $4^{1\,ff.}$. It is apparent also that 3^{12} was spoken in Hezekiah's reign and that $4^{1\,ff.}$ therefore are still later, which fact shows that the passage has no rightful place in Is. ch. 2, which is in any case earlier than Hezekiah's reign. Furthermore, the ideas of the passage are those characteristic of the postexilic age. The thought of the conversion of the nations appears nowhere else in the book of Micah, but is first found in monotheistic writings of the exilic and postexilic periods, *e. g.* Is. $56^{6.\,7}$ 60 66^{23} 11^{10} and Jonah. The pilgrimage to Mt. Zion is a postexilic idea, *cf.* Zc. $14^{16\,ff.}$, and its necessity could hardly have been felt until late in the postexilic age when the teachings of Deuteronomy and the Priestly Code had found such wide acceptance as to render the existence of local shrines like that of Elephantinê impossible for the zealous follower of the law. The expression באחרית הימים as denoting the opening of the Messianic era is first met with in Ez. 38^{16}. The conditions reflected in $4^{1\,ff.}$ are best satisfied by assigning the passage to the Greek period.

1. בית] 𝔊 om. here and Is. 2^{2}. Marti tr. to precede בראש.—נכון] In Is. 2^{2} preceding יהיה; so Marti; the metre shows the position in Micah to be preferable. 𝔊's double rendering here, *ἐμφανὲς* preceding יהיה as in

Isaiah and *ἕτοιμον* standing as in Micah, together with the position of נכון in Isaiah and 𝔊's rendering of the Isaiah passage, viz. *ἐμφανὲς τὸ ὄρος κυρίου καὶ ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπ' ἄκρου τῶν ὀρέων*, has led Du. (on Is. 2^2), followed by Marti, Stk. (*Die Dichtungen Jesaias* [1907]), Box (*Bk. of Is.* [1909]) and Gu. to reconstruct these two lines thus:

נכון יהיה הר יהוה
ובית אלהינו בראש ההרים

But 𝔐 of Micah furnishes a smoother metre and connection. The following נשא certainly refers to the הר יהוה and thus ignores any intervening בית א'. 𝔊's text of Isaiah may easily be accounted for as due to some prosaic glossator who felt the difficulty of a physical elevation of Mt. Zion and so substituted the house of Yahweh.—בראש] 𝔊 pl.; so GASm.. Elh. לראש.—הוא] Om. in Is. 2^2; so Siev..—ונהרו] The Pal.-Syr. fragment published by Mrs. Lewis offers the rendering *and will be gathered* = *συναχθήσονται*, not elsewhere found; but this is only free translation.—עָלָיו] Is. 2^2 אליו; so many codd. of Kenn. and de R.; so Siev., Gu., Hpt..—עַמִּים] Is. 2^2 כל הגוים (so Gu.). 𝔖 and some mss. of Micah insert כל.—**2.** גוים] Is. 2^3 עַמִּים.—רבים] Siev. om..—ואמרו] Du. (on Isaiah), Marti and Hpt. om..—ונעלה] 𝔊 𝔖 𝔙 om. ו.—ואל בית] ו is om. in Isaiah and in some mss. of Micah. Siev. om. all this line.—ויורנו] 𝔊 here = ויורונו; but in Isaiah sg. and also in the Pal.-Syr. version published by Mrs. Lewis.—מדרכיו] 𝔊 sg. and ignores מ. 𝔙 *de viis*.—Siev. om. the last two lines of this str. because they do not yield a seven-tone line.—**3.** ושפט] 𝔖 and 𝔖^H take "the law" as subj. of this vb..—עַמִּים רבים] Isaiah הגוים; Siev. om. רבים; so 𝔖.—והוכיח] 𝔙 *et corripiet*. —לגוים עצמים] Isaiah לְעַמִּים רבים. Siev. om. עצמים.—עד רחוק] Om. as a gloss with Isaiah; so Briggs (*Mess. Proph.*), Du., Marti, Siev., Gu., Hpt..—חרבתיהם] Isaiah חרבתם; so Siev..—לא] Some codd. ולא; so 𝔊 𝔖 𝔙.—ישאו] Sg. in Isaiah; so 𝔊 𝔖 𝔙 𝔗.—מלחמה] 𝔊 *πολεμεῖν*.—**4.** וישבו] 𝔊 *ἀναπαύσεται*. 𝔙 sg.. 𝔗 in common editions יתובון (= יָשֻׁבוּ), but in cod. Reuch. וְיִתְּבוּן.—**5.** בשם אלהיו] 𝔊 *τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ* (a theological change; *cf.* Am. 8^{14} Dt. 29^{26}), but the Pal.-Syr. version agrees with 𝔐.—Between the text of vv. $^{1-3}$ and Is. 2$^{2-4}$ there are in all twelve variations. The text of Micah is nearer the primitive form, as is evident from the position of נכון (v. ^{1}), the stronger עליו for אליו (v. ^{1}), the more concise עַמִּים for כל־הגוים (v. ^{1}), and the pl. ישאו (v. ^{3}) for the sg.. But the Micah text has undergone expansion; *v. s.*.

Str. I announces the acceptance of the religion of Yahweh by the nations at large.—**1.** *It will come to pass in the issue of the days*] *i. e.* at the end of the present age and coincident with the dawn of the Messianic era.* The phrase "in the issue of the days" occurs thirteen times in the OT., but belongs to the exilic and post-exilic circle of ideas, occurring only in 4^{14} Ho. 3^{5} Gn. 49^{1} Nu. 24^{14}, aside from Jeremiah, Ezekiel and later books; and these four passages are due to interpolation. Despairing of the present, the later prophets built their hopes upon the future, and out of the blackest days came the brightest visions of Israel's future glory—indisputable evidence of imperishable faith.—*That the mountain of Yahweh's house will be established at the top of the mountains*] This line, with the parallel line, *lifted up from the hills*,] does not mean a literal, physical elevation of Mt. Zion above the surrounding hills.* It is rather a figure representing the exaltation of Zion as superior to all other shrines and the focus of universal desire; *cf.* Is. 2^{14} 40^{4}. —*And peoples will flow unto it*, (2) *Yea, many nations will come, and say*:] This vision of the world-wide influence of Yahweh in the conversion of the nations unto himself is unparalleled outside of Judaism and its dependent faiths. It is a common thought in Deutero-Isaiah and the later literature of Israel; but it could not find expression until monotheism had become firmly fixed in the religious consciousness of Israel through the discipline of the exile. The prophecies of the eighth century contain no suggestions of this thought. Is. 11^{10} 18^{7} 19^{16-25} in which it is more or less fully expressed are quite generally conceded to be of late origin.

---

* *Cf.* Stk. *ZAW.* XI, 247 *ff.*.

Str. II explains why the nations gather at Jerusalem, viz. because there they can learn Yahweh's will which is the only safe guide for life.—**2.** *Come, let us go up to the mount of Yahweh, and to the house of the God of Jacob*] The nations mutually incite one another to undertake the religious pilgrimage. The implication is that the temple at Jerusalem is the only authorised sanctuary of Yahweh. This seems to force the dating of the passage in the post-Deuteronomic period. The point of view of Is. $19^{19.\ 21}$ and of the adherents of the Jewish temple at Elephantinê is foreign to this writer. 'Jacob' here designates the nation as a whole as in $3^{1.\ 8.\ 9}$, not the northern kingdom as in 1^{5}.—*That he may teach us of his ways, so that we may walk in his paths*] The phraseology suggests that these would-be disciples do not expect to know the whole of the divine will, but only such of it as is essential to their welfare.—*For from Zion goes forth instruction and the word of Yahweh from Jerusalem*] These words seem to close the utterance of the nations, rather than to resume the speech of the prophet. It is a recognition by the world at large that Jerusalem is the seat and source of all authoritative religious teaching. The word *tôrah* is here defined by the parallel phrase 'word of Yahweh,' and this, together with the absence of the article, makes the general meaning 'instruction' more probable than the specific 'law.' Furthermore, on the lips of non-Israelites the latter term would be an anachronism.

---

* *Contra* Marti.

Str. III declares the result of the nations' acceptance of Yahweh to be that all disputes will be referred to him and war will therefore be abolished.—**3.** *And he will judge between many peoples, and arbitrate for numerous nations*] As now all difficult cases in Israelitish litigation are brought to the priests as the court of last resort and to Yahweh as the supreme judge, so in the Messianic age the nations of the world will submit their differences to Yahweh, accepting without question his righteous decision. To emphasise the extent of Yahweh's dominion an editor here added the phrase *unto afar.—And they will hammer their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning-hooks*] The rendering 'ploughshares' is doubtful (*v. i.*), but some agricultural implement is certainly meant; weapons of war will be converted into tools of peaceful industry. For the reverse process, *cf.* Jo. 4^{10}.—*They will not lift up the sword, nation against nation; nor will they learn war any more*] *Cf.* Ps. 46^{9} Is. $9^{6.\,7}$ 11^{6-9} Zc. 9^{10}. While disarmament is here positively predicated only of the non-Israelitish nations, yet by implication Israel too is included. The prophet certainly does not conceive of Israel as dominating the rest of the world by force. This ideal of world-wide peace springs from the heart-longings of a people left broken and shattered by the stress of disastrous wars.

To this vision of glory are appended some supplementary details by later hands.—**4.** *And they will sit each under his vine and under his fig tree, with none to make them afraid*] This verse presents the positive aspect of the thought that was expressed negatively in v. [3]. The subject, however, is individual and not national as in v. [3]; the language portrays the peaceful Palestinian countryside with the rural inhabitants in the enjoyment of peace and plenty. The verse is made up of stock phrases, displaying none of the creative capacity of vv. $^{1-3}$; *cf.* 1 K. 4^{25} 2 K. 18^{31} Zc. 3^{10} Is. 17^{2} Je. 30^{10} 46^{27} Ez. 34^{28} Zp. 3^{13} Na. 2^{11} Lv. 26^{6}.—*For the mouth of Yahweh of hosts hath spoken it*] A concluding phrase commonly employed to attest the divine origin of a prophecy; *cf.* Is. 1^{20} 40^{5} 58^{14}.—**5.** *Though all the peoples walk each in the name of his God, yet we will walk in the name of Yahweh, our God, for ever and ever*] This is the utterance of a practical man who realises the visionary character of the foregoing ideal and seeks to establish connection with things as they are. Instead of one universal religion, it is *tot gentes quot dei.* But even so, and even should it always be so, Israel will remain faithful and true to Yahweh through endless time. The expression 'walk in the name of' is not elsewhere used; but it clearly means here that yielding of a hearty allegiance and obedience to the divine will spoken of in v. ^{4} as 'walking in his laws.' It is fanciful to find here a contrast between the loyal obedience of the nations to their gods and the defective honouring of Yahweh by the majority of his people;* or between the eternal 'walking' of Israel and the 'walking' of the heathen which is not eternal.† This verse is certainly not from the writer of vv. $^{1-3}$ or of v. ^{4}; for the general point of view of v. ^{4} is identical with that of vv. $^{1-3}$, while that of v. ^{5} is wholly different. The writer of vv. $^{1-3}$ lived wholly in the future; v. ^{5} is vividly conscious of the discordant present, and can only express Israel's determination to be true to her highest ideals at any cost. What is here expressed as a firm decision is found in Is. 2^{5} as an exhortation. The two verses are evidently closely related, but on which side the dependence lies is wholly uncertain.

1. והיה . . . יהיה] The subj. clause lacks an introductory particle.—יהיה . . . נכון] Late usage; Ges. $^{\S 116\,r}$.—עליו] Literally, ***upon it;*** stronger than אליו, Is. 2^{2}.—**2.** לכו] Including the speaker, Kö. $^{\S 344\,g}$.—אלהי יעקב] The only occurrence of this title in the book of Micah; so also יהוה צב׳ in v. ^{4}.—תצא] If fut. it belongs in mouth of the prophet; but better taken as present of an existing fact.—**3.** לְאִתִּים] Found only in 1 S. $13^{20\,f.}$ Jo. 4^{10}; the latter sheds no light upon the meaning; in the former the list of agricultural implements begins with מחרשתו, ***plough-***

* *Contra* Ry..

† *Contra* Pont.

share, hence it is unlikely that אֵת carries the same meaning; it is probable also that in 2 K. 6^5 'אֶת־הבר should read 'אֵת ה and be rendered "the axe of iron." 𝔊 renders by *ἄροτρον*, *plough*, except in 1 S. 13^{20}, where the indefinite *σκεῦος*, *tool*, appears.

§ 9. *The Doom of Exile and a Promise of Restoration* (4^{6-10}).

This section reflects a period when Jerusalem was in imminent danger from an invader. It foretells capture and exile as the inevitable outcome of the situation, but hastens to assuage the grief by the declaration that Yahweh will intervene, bringing deliverance from captivity and restoration to the home-land. It can be treated as a unit only by transposing vv. $^{9, 10}$ to precede vv. $^{6-8}$; *v. i.*. **Str. I** pictures Israel's bitter suffering and gently satirises the futility of human leaders. **Str. II** declares that even greater calamity is coming, but that Yahweh will thereupon deliver Israel from its foes. **Str. III** announces that Yahweh will then gather together the exiles. **Str. IV** promises their re-establishment as a mighty nation under Yahweh as their eternal king. **Str. V** reaches the climax with the assurance that Jerusalem will be restored as the nation's capital.

WHEREFORE, now, dost thou cry so loud?
Is there no king in thee,
Or, has thy counsellor perished,
That agony has seized thee like one in childbirth?
WRITHE and bring forth, O daughter of Zion, like one in childbirth.
For now thou must go forth from the city and dwell in the field,
And go to Babylon; there shalt thou be rescued.
There Yahweh will redeem thee from the hand of thine enemies.
IN that day, it is the oracle of Yahweh,
I will gather the halt,
And the outcast I will assemble,
And her whom I have afflicted.
AND I will make the halt a remnant,
And her that was sick a strong nation.
And Yahweh will be king over them in Mount Zion.
From now on even forever.
AND thou, O tower of the flock,
Height of the daughter of Zion,
Unto thee will come the first dominion;
Yea, there will come the kingdom of the house of Israel.

The prevailing measure in this section is trimeter, but there are many variations. Str. II is in the rhythm of the dirge. Though the metre is on the whole very broken, the parall. is clear and furnishes the only safe guide to the length of lines and the formation of strs.. Siev.'s arrangement in three strs. of $3+3+2$ seven-tone lines ignores this guidance, as is evident from the fact that עתה למה (v. ^{9}) appears in the middle of one of his strs., and even of one of his lines, instead of starting a new line and str. as it clearly must. In the present arrangement, vv. $^{9.\ 10}$ are placed before vv. $^{6-8}$ in response to the demands of the logic. They furnish the presuppositions requisite to the understanding of the message of vv. $^{6-8}$. The resulting movement of thought is clear and straightforward throughout the piece. It seems unnecessary to assign vv. $^{6-8}$ and $^{9.\ 10}$ to different authors and periods as has been done by Kue., We., Volz, Now., Marti, Hpt., *et al.*. As here arranged, vv. $^{9.\ 10}$ furnish the necessary preparation for vv. $^{6-8}$. The order of events becomes perfectly natural—downfall of Jerusalem, exile, deliverance, restoration to power. The date of the prophecy cannot be definitely determined, but it would seem to have originated in the dark days just prior to the fall of Jerusalem in 597 or 586 B.C.. Those who claim vv. $^{9.\ 10}$ for Micah (Kue., *et al.*) are under the necessity of excising "and thou shalt go to Babylon" (v. ^{10}), but this phrase is demanded by the poetic form of v. ^{10}, and is, furthermore, in harmony with the background of the whole section. In support of the period suggested by this phrase may be urged the advanced stage in the conception of the 'remnant' (*v. i.*), the significance of the phrase "tower of the flock" (*v. i.*), and the general Messianic tone of the passage. The only serious alternative to this date is suggested by the not altogether unlikely view that this is a *vaticinium post eventum* (so We., Marti; but *v. i.*), in which case a period after Deutero-Isaiah and the return may be sought.

6. נאם י׳] Siev. om..—הצלעה] 𝔖 *the distant ones;* similarly 𝔗.—ואשר הרעתי] 𝔊 *καὶ οὓς ἀπωσάμην.* Now. om.; so Siev.; *cf.* Zp. 3^{19}. Ro., Elh. וַאֲשֶׁר אשר ה׳. Kö. $^{§ 413m}$ om. אשר and points וְהֵרֵעֹתִי. Gr. adds איטיב. Du. ואשיב א׳ הר׳. —**7.** והנהלאה] Rd., with We., וְהַנַּחֲלָה; so Now., Marti, Gu., Du.. 𝔙 *et eam quae laboraverat* = וְהַנִּלְאָה; so Stei., Gr., Oort$^{Em.}$, Hpt.. 𝔊^{A} *καὶ τὴν ἀπωσμένην.* Siev. וְהַחֹלָה.—בהר ציון] Perhaps a marg. n.; *cf.* 𝔖's addition of *and in Jerusalem.*—**8.** עֹפֶל] The Vrss. have confused this with אֹפֶל; so Aq. *σκοτώδης*; 𝔊 *αὐχμώδης*; 𝔙 *nebulosa;* Σ *ἀπόκρυφος*; 𝔗 טְמִיר; 𝔖 *dark.*—תאתה] Ry. om. as gloss upon באה; so Taylor, Pont, Du..—ובאה] Tr., with Ro., to precede ממלכה; so Elh., Now., Oort$^{Em.}$, Marti. Hpt. om. as gloss on תאתה.—ממלכת] Cod. Kenn. 4 om.. Marti, הַמַּמְלָכָה. 𝔊 adds *ἐκ Βαβυλῶνος.*—לבת ירושלם] Rd., foll. We., Now., Du. לְבַת ישראל. Cod. Reuch. of 𝔗 offers ישראל for ירושלם. Oort$^{Em.}$, Siev. and Gu. om. לבת.—**9.** עתה] Siev. and Gu. om..—תריעי רע] 𝔊 *ἔγνως κακά* = חדעי רַע. 𝔖 *doest thou evil*, taking vb. as Hiph. of רעע and reading רַע as obj., with 𝔊. 𝔙 *moerore contraheris*, deriving vb. from רָעָה II. 𝔗 *connectest thou thyself with peoples.*—יוֹעֲצֵךְ] 𝔊 *ἡ βουλή σου*; so also in Pr. 11[14] Is. 9[5]. 𝔖 𝔗 pl..—**10.** חולי וגחי] 𝔊 *ὤδινε καὶ ἀνδρίζου καὶ ἔγγιζε*, of which *ἀνδρίζου* is to be taken, with Ry., as a duplicate rendering of חוּלִי, which was wrongly connected with חַיִל; while *ἔγγιζε* represents a confusion of גחי with גְּשִׁי. 𝔖's rendering of חולי corresponds to 𝔊's *ἀνδρίζου*. 𝔊[A] 𝔏 and codd. 87, 91, 97, 228, 310, 𝔖[H] om. *καὶ ἔγγιζε*. גחי is rendered by 𝔙, *satage;* 𝔗 וזעי. Elh. and Che.[CB] וְהֻגִּי; *cf.* Je. 48[31]. *HWB.*[15] וּפְגִי; *cf* Is. 42[14]; so Now., Gu.. Pont, הגיחי. Gr. and Marti וְהֵאָנְחִי.—תִּנָּצְלִי] 𝔊 *ῥύσεταί σε.*—שם יגאלך] 𝔊[B] om.. Several codd. of Kenn. שָׁם; so 𝔊[AQ] 𝔖.—יְהוָה] 𝔊 adds *ὁ θεός σου.*

Str. I, in good trimeter, brings out through three questions the desperate situation in which Israel now finds itself.—**9.** *Wherefore, now, dost thou cry so loud?*] Jerusalem is on the verge of a siege apparently, or already besieged. The anguish of the cry is to be inferred from the last line of this str.. The person addressed is "the daughter of Zion" (v. [10]). *Now* is not temporal, but logical; it lends a tone of expostulation to the question.—*Is there no king in thee, or has thy counsellor perished?*] The confusion and terror in the city are so great, it would seem that no ruler was present (*cf.* Ho. 13[10]). The term 'counsellor,' used of the Messiah in Is. 9[6], is here a synonym for 'king,' rather than a collective for citizens pre-eminently wise (*cf.* Is. 36[5]). The common meaning of the root מלך in Assy. is *advise, counsel.* For a similar question, *cf.* Je. 8[19]. This question does not imply the actual absence of a king, involving a postexilic date for the passage, but is ironical and derisive. Of what use is it to trust in those who cannot help? Marti considers Yahweh to be the king here mentioned, but this is an interpretation made necessary by his view that the passage is postexilic.*—*That agony has seized thee like one in childbirth?*] A figure frequently employed as the most vivid description of physical pain; *cf.* Je. 6[24] 22[23].

Str. II, with a change from trimeter to the dirge movement so well adapted to the contents of the str., announces the climax of calamity, but only as a background for a message of hope.—**10.**

---

* *Cf.* Sellin, *Serubbabel*, 67 *ff.*, who, though accepting the postexilic origin of these verses, still insists that a human monarch is meant, and so seeks to posit a short period of monarchy under Zerubbabel; but in *Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte der jüdischen Gemeinde.* II. 174 *ff.*, this view is in part abandoned.

Writhe and bring forth, O daughter of Zion, like one in childbirth] The figure in the previous line (v. [9]) is here taken up and enlarged upon. Having ironically inquired in **Str. I** why Jerusalem abandons herself to grief, the prophet here in all seriousness says, 'thou hast good reason to agonise.'—*For now thou must go forth from the city and dwell in the field*] *i. e.* from the protection of the walled city into the open country, exposed to inclement weather, wild beasts, and hostile armies. For exit from the city as denoting surrender, *cf.* Is. 36^{16} 2 K. 24^{12}. *Now, i. e.* in a little while, soon; *cf.* $7^{4.\ 10}$ Am. 6^{7}.—*And go to Babylon*] Those who would retain vv. $^{9.\ 10}$ for Micah are forced to regard this phrase as an interpolation,* for it is unlikely that Micah had the Babylonian captivity before his mind. Israel's enemy in Micah's age was Assyrian, and Babylon was playing a subordinate part. It is clear also from chs. 1–3 that Micah expected the doom of Judah to follow close upon that of Samaria, and Je. $26^{18\text{ f.}}$ shows that the time for the fulfilment of Micah's prediction there cited was regarded as being long past in Jeremiah's day. The force of these objections to the phrase is not overcome by the suggestion that Babylon is representative of the Assyrian empire as being one of its most powerful kingdoms, nor by the fact that Sargon transported some of the population of Babylonia to northern Israel (2 K. 17^{24}), and may therefore be supposed to have put Israelites in their places, thus suggesting to Micah a destination for Judah's exiles. Micah and contemporary prophets were occupied with Assyria, the world-power of the eighth century B.C.. But all that goes to show this phrase to be of late origin is evidence for the late date of the verse in which it stands, for the verse is incomplete without this clause which is essential both to form and content.† It is the only satisfactory antecedent to the following *there*, which cannot go back to the elusive and indefinite *field*.—*There shalt thou be rescued; there will Yahweh redeem thee from the hand of thine enemies*] The thought that deliverance from the foe would be accomplished in Babylonia and that this was but the first step in the coming of the Messianic glory was common from the time of Deutero-Isaiah; *cf.* $43^{1-7.\ 14-20}$ 44^{24-28} 45^{11-17} $55^{12.\ 13}$. It is impossible to say definitely when it first found expression, but the basis for it was laid in Isaiah's doctrine of the remnant. When it became quite clear that a Babylonian captivity was inevitable, it is reasonable to suppose that the deathless hope of the prophets never for a moment accepted this as final, but looked forward to the time when Yahweh should glorify himself in the sight of the nations through the rescue and exaltation of his people. Interpreting v. [10] from this point of view, it is not necessary to suppose with Marti that the prophet wrote, like Deutero-Isaiah, in the full light of the victorious career of Cyrus, and thus to class his prediction as in large part a *vaticinium post eventum.* All that is said here is quite intelligible on the lips of a contemporary of Jeremiah's later years.

---

* So *e. g.* Oort, Kue., WRS. *Proph.*, de Goeje, Now., Nö., Pont, GASm..

† So *e. g.* We., Marti, Du.; *cf.* van H., who retains the context as the utterance of Micah, but relegates v. [10] as a whole to a later period. Du. likewise makes v. [10] a still later addition to vv. [6-9] which are themselves late.

Str. III, dropping the *qîna* rhythm and taking up a dimeter movement, represents Yahweh as reassembling the afflicted exiles. While vv. [6-8] have no connection with their context as they stand in 𝕸, the case is altogether different when they follow v. [10]; for the thought of the halt and afflicted, inappropriate after the picture of universal peace in 4^{1-5}, is peculiarly in place after such a catastrophe as is described in vv. [9-10].—**6.** *In that day, it is the oracle of Yahweh*] The day of Yahweh is in the prophet's mind, which day was commonly looked upon as closing the period of present distress and inaugurating the future age of bliss. "That day" here marks the end of the exile.—*I will gather the halt, and the outcast I will assemble*] The words 'halt' and 'outcast,' suggestive of a flock of sheep, designate the exilic community as a whole, not individual members of that community. At the time when these words were written the *diaspora* had already begun. The descendants of the captives from Samaria were scattered throughout the Babylonian empire; refugees from Judah had doubtless already founded colonies in Egypt like that at Elephantinê; Jehoahaz and his courtiers had been carried to Egypt; and perhaps the blow of 597 B.C. had fallen. All of these are to be gathered home in the great day.—*And her whom I have afflicted*] The fact that these words are missing in Zp. 3^{19} where the two preceding lines recur is not sufficient evidence for treating them as an interpolation here;* they furnish a comprehensive statement summarising the situation. The prophets never hesitated to ascribe any of Israel's calamities to the hand of Yahweh, but always as punishment for sin.

Str. IV, in trimeter movement, declares the coming exaltation of the remnant of the nation and its permanence as Yahweh's people.—**7.** *And I will make the halt a remnant, and her that was sick a strong nation*] The parallelism shows that the term 'remnant' is practically equivalent to the corresponding term 'strong nation.' This implies, as We. has noted, a much more advanced stage in the development of the idea of the remnant than can be imagined for the eighth century when Isaiah was first giving clear expression to the conception; *cf.* Is. 7^3 $8^{16\text{ ff.}}$ $10^{20\text{ ff.}}$ Am. 8^{15}. It presupposes a time when the idea had been long familiar and the mere mention of the term carried with it the suggestion of all the glory and splendour of the Messianic age that had gradually gathered around the thought of the remnant. For 'her that was sick' 𝔐 reads 'her that was far removed'; *v. s.*.—*And Yahweh will be king over them*] in a larger and truer sense than ever before and to the exclusion of any human being; *cf.* Is. 24^{23} 52^7.—*In Mount Zion*] This reflects an attitude toward Jerusalem quite contrary to that of chs. 1–3, and common only after the adoption of the Deuteronomic Code. The metrical form seems to point to this phrase as a gloss.—*From now on even forever*] 'Now,' *i. e.* in the immediate future, deliverance will be wrought; *cf.* the similar use of 'now' in v. ^{10}.

Str. V, in trimeter measure, promises the restoration of the old-time glory and power to Jerusalem.—**8.** *And thou, O tower of the flock*] The figure of Israel as a flock of sheep is resumed from vv. $^{6.\ 7a}$. The 'tower' was an elevated structure overlooking the sheepfold in which the flock was gathered for the night (Nu. 32^{16}). From this watch-tower the shepherd could keep a lookout for marauding beasts (2 Ch. 26^{10}; *cf.* 2 K. 17^9 18^8). The phrase is not therefore an allusion to Jerusalem as a scene of desolation,† but rather as the headquarters of Yahweh, the protector of Israel; *cf* Is. 14^{32}. The figure, perhaps, reflects the experience of Jerusalem in the campaign of Sennacherib, 701 B.C., which placed the stamp of Yahweh's approval upon the city for later generations.—*Height of the daughter of Zion*] עֹפֶל, *height*, is used of fortified hills in general (2 K. 5^{24}; *Mesha-Inscr.*, l. 22), and also specifically of the southern end of the hill Moriah, between the temple and Siloam (2 Ch. 27^{3} 33^{14} Ne. $3^{26.\ 27}$ 11^{21}). Here, as in Is. 32^{14}, it is either used in its general sense, or by synecdoche designates the whole of Jerusalem by the specific name of a portion.—*Unto thee will come the first dominion*] The reference is probably to the days of the kingdom under David and Solomon when Jerusalem was the capital of the whole nation. Allusion to the prosperous days of the double kingdom under Jeroboam II and Uzziah is less natural; while to say that the implied contrast must be between the post-exilic régime and the pre-exilic* as a whole is without any basis. It is possible that 'first' here is used in the sense of 'chief' and thus describes the dominion as the greatest in the world, the world-empire.—*Yea, there will come the kingdom of the house of Israel*] With the transposition of the verb 'come' (*v. s.*), there is preserved here the regularity and symmetry so characteristic of the parallelism of these verses. 𝔐 reads 'there will come the kingdom of the daughter of Jerusalem'; but this is a prosaic repetition of the previous line and adds nothing. As corrected, the second line points out that Jerusalem's great honour is to come to her as the representative of the entire nation, the people of Yahweh. The kingdom will be such an one as will be worthy of Israel's exalted relation.

---

* *Contra* Gu..

† *Contra* We., Now., Marti.

9. רֵעַ] On acc. cog. as substitute for inf. abs., Ges. $^{\S\ 113\ w.\ 117\ q}$.—**10.** וָגֹחִי] Irregular vocalisation might be for euphonic variation after חוּלִי; *cf.* דוּשִׁי in v. ^{13} and Kö. $^{I.\ 505}$, Sta. $^{\S\ 599b}$; but in Gn. 43^{13} under similar circumstances such variation is not made, and there are other *ō* imvs. and infs. from *û* impfs., where euphony plays no part, *e. g.* מוֹט (Ps. 38^{17} 46^{3}), נוֹעַ (Is. 7^{2}). The meaning of the vb. as used elsewhere (viz. in Aram., Ar., and Jb. 38^{8} 40^{23}) is 'gush forth,' 'break forth.' In view of this, we might render here, 'burst forth' (*i. e.* into weeping, lamentation, etc.), especially since the thought of a new birth for Israel is not at all present in the speaker's thought, but only the attendant suffering; and since the meaning "bring forth," *i. e.* in childbirth, is very doubtful for the vb. גחי.—בת ציון] *i. e.* the people, not the town; Kö. $^{\S\ 337\ t}$.—**6.** אספה] Qal impf. of אסף, treated as כ״א vb., and often confused with Hiph. of יסף. The ה ָ (4 times in 2 lines) is probably used for poetic assonance, and not with any specific meaning.—הצלעה] The fem. used as a coll.; Ges. $^{§ 122 s}$.—**7.** וְהַנַּהֲלָאָה] A Niph. prtc. from a denom. vb. הלא not elsewhere used, but the existence of such a vb. is very doubtful; the Vrss. had difficulty with the word, 𝔊^{A} 𝔗 rendering it just like הנדחה of v. ^{6}, 𝔊^{B} using a slightly different word (ἐξωσμ′ for ἀπωσμ′), 𝔙 rendering as if from לאה, and 𝔖 using same words here as for צלעה and נדחה in v. ^{6}, but in transposed order; 𝔏 has *expulsam* in v. ^{6} and *projectam* here, but this is only for the sake of variety as appears from the renderings *adflictam* and *contribulatam* for the one word הצלעה in the two verses. The proposed reading הנחלה accounts well for the corruptions of 𝔐 and 𝔙, and its position together with its similarity to הנדחה might easily have misled 𝔊.—**8.** מגדל עדר] Gn. 35^{21} (J), the only other place where this title occurs, evidently refers to a locality between Ephrath and Hebron, and apparently nearer to the former than to the latter. But Ephrath was in the vicinity of Bethel, hence the application of the term is different from its usage here. Similar names are מגדל גד (Jos. 15^{37}), מ׳ הלבנון (Ct. 7^{4}), מ׳ פנואל (Ju. 8^{17}), מ׳ שכם (Ju. 9^{46}), מ׳ אל (Jos. 19^{38}).—עפל] If used here as a proper name (*v. s.*), it designates a place on the southern slope of the eastern or temple hill; *cf.* GASm. *Jerusalem*, I, 152 *ff.*; Paton, *Jerusalem in Bible Times*, 64. The basal idea of the word is 'swelling,' 'protuberance,' as appears from the Arabic root and from its use in 1 S. $5^{6.\,9.\,12}$ Dt. 28^{27}. The Assy. *ublu, boil, ulcer* (Dl.^{HWB}) should perhaps be read *uplu* (Jensen, *ThLZ.* 1895, p. 250).—תאתה] The use of this Aramaic word might perhaps be urged against Micah's authorship; but it is unnecessary to go further down than Jeremiah's time for Aramaisms, in the light of the general and widespread use of Aramaic revealed by the discovery of the Assuan papyri and by the Aramaic dockets on Assyrian and Babylonian contract tablets dating as early as the time of Sennacherib. On preformative ֵ, as regularly in Aram., instead of ô, *cf.* Ges.$^{§ 68 f}$.—ממלכת] On cstr. before prep., *cf.* Ges.$^{§ 130 a}$, Kö.$^{§ 336 w}$. The function of the prep. is to define the relation between cstr. and gen. specifically; H.$^{§ 9.2b}$. Thus the meaning here is not 'kingdom over' but 'kingdom for,' or 'belonging to.'—בת ירושלם] בית may easily have been written בת as in *Meša-Inscr.*, l. 23, Phœnician, Palmyrene, Sabaean; and, through the influence of בת ציון in l. 2, ירושלם displaced ישראל.

---

* So We., Now..

§ 10. *The Triumph of Israel* (4^{11-13}).

In two strs. of six lines each and in trimeter measure, the prophet describes the scene of Israel's final vindication at Yahweh's hands. **Str. I** depicts the assembling of the nations of the earth for the purpose of crushing Israel, whereas Yahweh's purpose is to use Israel to crush them. **Str. II** shows Israel turning upon her foes and, with Yahweh's aid, vanquishing them and dedicating their booty to Yahweh.

AND now there are gathered against thee
Many nations, who say: Let her be desecrated,
And let our eyes fasten upon Zion.
But they know not the purposes of Yahweh;
Nor do they understand his plan,
That he hath gathered them like grain to the threshing-floor.
ARISE and thresh, O daughter of Zion;
For thy horn I will make iron,
And thy hoofs I will make bronze.
And thou shalt crush many peoples,
And thou shalt devote their spoil to Yahweh,
And their wealth to the Lord of all the earth.

This passage reflects other conditions than those with which vv. $^{9.\ 10.\ 6-8}$ deal. In both descriptions Jerusalem is in a state of siege; but there the result of the siege is the fall of the city and the exile of its inhabitants; deliverance comes only after captivity has begun. Here, Jerusalem turns upon its foes and conquers those who came confident of victory. There, the enemy is evidently the Babylonian; here, the whole pagan world gathers against Yahweh's people. This last feature was first incorporated in the prophetic descriptions of the 'latter days' by Ezekiel (38^{15} $39^{4-6.\ 18}$) and in such a way as to indicate that it was original with him. Hence this oracle must belong to a late exilic or a postexilic date. The whole spirit of the passage is consonant with such a date. In view of 3^{12} alone, Micah's authorship of this section seems out of the question.

The text of the passage is well preserved. The two strs. present each a distinct phase of the situation and together constitute a complete representation of the scene. The metre is regular except in lines 2 and 4 of Str. I, where tetrameters appear. To separate Str. I from Str. II on this account alone, with Siev., seems to be placing too much stress upon considerations of form. The two are bound together into one prophecy by identity of situation and point of view.

11. ועתה] 𝔖 om. ו.—תחנף] 𝔊 *ἐπιχαρούμεθα*. 𝔙 *lapidetur*. Aq. (acc. to $𝔖^{H}$) *will fall into wrath*. 𝔖 treats ציון as subj. of תחנף, and עינינו as subj. of תחז, for which it supplies a pron. as obj.. We. תִּסָּחֵף.—עינינו] 4 mss., 𝔖 𝔙 𝔗 sg., עֵינֵנוּ. 𝔊 has pl., but puts vb. in pl. to agree with subj..—**12.** מחשבות] 𝔊 𝔖 sg..—עָמִיר] 𝔙 *foenum* (*hay*) as always in 𝔙. 𝔖 *ears of grain*. 𝔊 *δράγματα* (*sheaves*). Aq. Σ *chaff*. Θ *a stalk of grain*.—**13.** קרנך] 𝔊 𝔖 pl..—הדקות] $𝔊^{B}$ *κατατήξεις*. $𝔊^{A.\ Q\ 153.\ 233}$ λεπτυνεῖς. $𝔊^{Y}$ combines both renderings, *καταπατήσεις ἐν αὐταῖς ἔθνη καὶ λεπτυνεῖς* λαοὺς πολλούς; *cf.* 𝔏 *et tabescere faciam in eis gentes et minutatim facies plebes multas.* 𝔙 *comminues.* 𝔖 om. conj. ו.—הַחֲרַמְתִּי] Rd. as 2d pers., with 𝔊 𝔖 𝔙 𝔗, and nearly all interpreters.—חֵילָם] 𝔊 *τὴν ἰσχὺν αὐτῶν*; so 𝔙.

Str. I states Yahweh's purpose to thwart the evil intentions of the nations toward Israel.—**11.** *And now there are gathered against thee*] Jerusalem is addressed. The prophet's 'now' is at the end of the days, whither he has transported himself in spirit. The situation he depicts here cannot be identified with any set of known historical circumstances, not even the Maccabaean (*pace* Hpt.). It is the vision of a seer.—*Many nations, who say:*] The gathering of the nations in array against Jerusalem is a characteristic idea of exilic and postexilic prophecy; *cf.* Ez. 38 and 39; Jo. $3^{2.\ 12}$ Zc. 12^{1-9} Is. $29^{7.\ 8}$ 41^{11-16} Zp. 3^{8}. It belongs to the later eschatological aspect of prophecy. Pre-exilic prophecy sends its roots deep down into contemporaneous history; its visions of the future are indissolubly linked with the conditions of the present; Yahweh's activities in Israel's destiny are all historically mediated. But in the later eschatology, as here, the pictures of the future bear no necessary relation to the circumstances of the present, and Yahweh's interventions are direct and immediate; not by human agencies, but by divine forces.*—*Let her be desecrated*] The choice of language is determined by the prophet's own point of view which is that Israel's land is holy to Yahweh and the tread of the nations is desecrating; *cf.* Jo. 3^{17}. The same figure appears in Is. 24^{5} Ps. 106^{38} Je. $3^{1.\ 2.\ 9}$ Nu. 35^{33}.—*And let our eyes fasten on Zion*] *i. e.* gloat in triumph upon the fallen city; *cf.* La. 2^{16} Ob. 12 *f.*.—**12.** *But they know not the purposes of Yahweh, nor do they understand his plan*] *Cf.* Is. $55^{8\,f.}$ Ps. 92^{5} Rom. 11^{33}. Just so Isaiah (10^{5-19}) had pictured the Assyrian army as unconsciously working out the purpose of Yahweh in reference to Israel, only to fall in turn a victim to Yahweh's righteous wrath. "The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him" (Ps. 25^{14}).—*That he hath gathered them like grain to the threshing-floor*] This is the content of the plan in question. Threshing is a favourite simile with the prophets: *cf.* Am. 1^3 2 K. 13^7 Hb. 3^{12} Je. 51^{33} Is. 21^{10} 41^{15}.

---

* Gressmann's attempt (*Eschatologie*, 177 *ff.*) to retain these verses as Micah's involves too much of unproved hypothesis and does not carry conviction even to those in sympathy with his general contention, *e. g.* Stk. *Das assyrische Weltreich*, 132.

Str. II promises Israel complete victory over the nations assembled to humiliate her.—**13.** *Arise and thresh, O daughter of Zion*] The prophet's national pride finds expression in this representation of Israel as the agent of Yahweh in crushing the arrogant foes.—*For thy horn I will make iron and thy hoofs bronze*] Israel is addressed as "the ox which treadeth out the grain" (Dt. 25^4 Ho. 10^{11}). The reference to horns here is foreign to the figure of the threshing-floor, and introduces a new element into the picture —that of the angry ox goring the foe; *cf.* 1 K. 22^{11} Dt. 33^{17}.—*And thou shalt crush many peoples*] The verb here means 'to pulverise,' 'to reduce to fine dust'; hence practical annihilation of the nations is here contemplated.—*And thou shalt devote to Yahweh their spoil*] Not the booty taken by them from others,* but the prey taken from them by Israel. There is no sharp distinction between the 'spoil' of this line and the parallel 'wealth' of the following line. This is all to be placed under the ban, *i. e.* everything combustible is to be burned, and the non-combustibles, silver, gold, etc., are to be presented to the treasury of the temple; *cf.* Jos. $6^{17-19.\,24}$. Other instances of the ban are found in Ex. 22^{19} Dt. 13^{6-19} Ju. 1^{17} 1 S. 15.—*And their wealth to the Lord of the whole earth*] This title as applied to Yahweh is found only here, in the late passages Zc. 4^{14} 6^5 Ps. 97^5, and in Jos. $3^{11.\,13}$ (J), where it is generally conceded to be interpolated;† *cf.* Dt. 10^{14}. The ill-gotten gain of the nations is to be given to the God of the world, to whom it rightfully belongs.

11. האמרים] Prtc. with art. after indeterminate noun is equiv. to an attributive clause; Kö. $^{\S\,411\,d}$.—תחנף] On fem. sg. of vb. with subj. in pl. (not *dual*, as in Ges. $^{\S\,145\,n}$, and Kö. $^{\S\,347}$), *cf.* Ges. $^{\S\,145\,k}$.—**12.** עמיר] Not specifically *sheaves*, but the grain in the swath; *v.* BDB. and *cf.* the renderings of the Vrss. here.—גֹּרְנָה] Baer, incorrectly, גֹּרֶנָה; Ges. $^{\S\,90\,i}$.—**13.** וָדוֹשִׁי] On pointing, *cf.* v. ^{10}.—וְהַחֲרַמְתִּי] Old 2d pers. sg. fem. end. ־תִי, which occurs in several cases, *e. g.* in pron. אַתְּי; always in form of vb. before pronominal suffixes; in corresponding pron. of Assy., *atti;*

---

* *Contra* Now., Marti.

† So *e. g.* Carpenter and Battersby, Holzinger, Addis, Kent Dillmann (?); *contra* Steuernagel.

in the verbal end. *ti* in Ar., Syr., and sporadically in Aram.. Other instances of תי with vb. in Heb. are Je. 2^{33} $3^{4.\,5}$ 31^{21} 46^{11} Jd. $3^{3.\,4}$ Ez. $16^{13.\,18.\,22.\,31.\,36.\,43.\,47.\,51}$, where the Mas. recognised it as 2d pers. and so pointed תְי; and Je. 2^{20} Ez. 16^{50} where it was mistaken for 1st pers..—ארון כל־הארץ] *Cf.* קנה שמים וארץ, Gn. 14^{19}; and the Ranal Inscr., which mentions "the Lord (Baal) of heaven and earth."

§ 11. *A Call to Mourning* (4^{14}).

A fragment of an oracle dealing with some siege of Jerusalem, perhaps that of Sennacherib, or that of Nebuchadrezzar, or some one unknown. It seems to reflect an actual historical situation, rather than a prophet's vision of the last days. But the material is too scant to furnish a basis for assignment to any specific date. Its closest connection is with vv. [9. 10] and it may have belonged originally after v. [9] or as a marginal note on v. [10] (so Marti). It has been generally recognised that no connection exists with what precedes, as is shown by the absence of ו from before עתה and by the totally different thought conveyed. Halévy places it after 6^{12}, but no real connection is thereby attained.

14. תתגדדי בת גדוד] Rd., with We., הִתְגֹּדֵד הִתְגֹּדְדִי, or *vice versa;* so Now., Marti, Siev., Gu., Du., Hpt.. 𝔊 *ἐμφραχθήσεται θυγάτηρ ἐμφραγμῷ*, mistaking the 2d ד for ר; *cf.* van H., תִּתְגַּדְּרִי בֵּית גָּדֵר. Σ *ὠδινήσουσί σε θυγ' συνεχομένη.* 𝔙 *vastaberis filia latronis.* 𝔖 *thou shalt go forth in a troop, O daughter of troops.*—שם] Rd., with 𝔖 𝔙 𝔗, שָׂמוּ; so Taylor, Pont, Now., Marti, Gu.. Σ *ἐτέθη.* Hal. שִׂמִי. Ro. שֻׂם; *cf.* Ry. p. 82.—יכו] Hal. הַכִּי.—שפט] 𝔊 *τὰς πύλας.* 𝔖 *shepherd*, perhaps = שֵׁבֶט. Cod. 548 (de R.) שֹׁפְטֵי; so Dathe, Gr.. Van H. שבטי, foll. 𝔊. Hpt. בַּשֵּׁבֶט.

14. *Now thou art cutting thyself severely*] Zion is addressed, not Babylon nor Assyria. Cutting of one's flesh was an element in the old Semitic mourning-cult and was long retained by the Israelites; Dt. 14^{1}. It was resorted to also as an act of worship and entreaty in cases of dire necessity; *cf.* 1 K. 18^{28}.* The usual rendering of 𝔐 is, "Now, thou shalt gather in troops, O daughter of troops," referring to the assembling of Zion's army to resist the assault about to be made. But Je. 5^7 offers the only case where התְגודד must mean "assemble," and there it is far better to follow 𝔊 *κατελυον* and read יִתְגוֹרְרוּ, *make themselves at home.** This reference to a practice forbidden by the Deuteronomic law may point to an early date before the religious consciousness of Israel had branded the custom as heathenish, or it may be due to the fact that the prophet is merely describing what is actually taking place, and neither commanding nor approving it.—*A siege they lay against us*] The prophet now identifies himself with his suffering people. The plural שָׂמוּ is required by the corresponding יַכּוּ. A similar situation is depicted in Is. $1^{7.\ 8}$.—*With a rod they smite upon the cheek the ruler of Israel*] The pun upon שפט and שבט is clear, the former being used rather than מלך or משל to make the paronomasia; *cf.* Am. 2^3. Such treatment was grossly insulting; *cf.* 1 K. 22^{24} Jb. 16^{10}. It may refer to the insults heaped upon Hezekiah (Is. 36^{4-20}) by Sennacherib's general, or to the fact that the arrogance of the foe was an insult to Israel's greater king, Yahweh.

---

* Hpt. denies the religious significance of the act of cutting oneself in mourning and declares it a symbolical perpetuation of the early custom in accordance with which mourners scratched themselves till the blood ran in order to show their grief. But on this supposition the prohibition in Dt. 14^{1} Lv. 19^{28} 21^{5} is hard to account for. Nor can the custom be dissociated from such practices as appear in 1 K. 18^{28}.

§ 12. *The Messianic King* (5^{1-3}).

This eight-line str., secured by omitting v. [2] as a gloss, announces the coming of the Messiah, sprung from an ancient line, who shall rule as Yahweh's representative and in his might over the entire world.

AND thou, Beth Ephrathah,
The least among the clans of Judah,
From thee one will come forth for me,
Who will be ruler over Israel,
Whose origins are from of old, from ancient days.
And he will stand and shepherd (his flock) in the strength of Yahweh,
In the majesty of the name of Yahweh, his God;
For now he will be great unto the ends of the earth.

The trimeter movement of this str. is somewhat uneven; l. 3 forms a light trimeter while ll. 5 and 8 are extremely heavy. The reconstruction includes the omission of a word each from ll. 1, 2, and 8 (*v. i.*), in addition to the excision of v. [2]. The arrangement in pentameters by Siev. includes all of these omissions except that in l. 8, but likewise finds it necessary to suppose the loss of three words from v. ^{3}. V. ^{2} is om. by Du. (on Is. 7^{14}), G. H. Skipwith (*JQR.* VI, 584); Now., F. Ladame, Marti, Siev., Gu., Hpt.. It interrupts the connection between vv. $^{1 \text{ and } 3}$, and changes from the first person of v. ^{1} (לי) to the third in v. ^{2} (יתנם), where Yahweh is evidently intended.

---

* So *e. g.* Gie., Du., Cor., Dr..

The date of vv. $^{1.\ 3}$ cannot be decisively settled. The attitude of respect for the ancient Davidic dynasty and the largeness of the Messianic expectation make it reasonably certain that the oracle must be assigned somewhere in the postexilic age. The period of Haggai and Zechariah when Messianic hopes were gathering around the name of Zerubbabel furnishes the kind of background necessary to such an utterance as this. On v. ^{3}, *v. i.*.

1. בית לחם אפרתה] Om. לחם as a gloss; so cod. 161 (Kenn.), Ro., Pont, We., GASm., Now., Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, Marti, Siev., Gu., Du., Hpt.. 𝔊 *Βεθλέεμ οἶκος Ἐφράθα.* Mt. 2^{6} *Βεθλεὲμ γῆ Ἰούδα.* Comp. *οἶκος τοῦ Βεθλέεμ τοῦ Εὐφράθα.*—צעיר] Rd., with Hi., בְּצָעִיר; *cf.* 𝔊 *ὀλιγοστὸς εἶ*; so Ro., Taylor, Pont, We., Kosters, GASm., Now., Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, Marti, Siev., Gu., Du., Hpt.. Twenty-one mss. cited by HP., together with 𝔄, 𝔏, Mt. 2^{6}, Justin Martyr and Chrysostom, introduce a negative before צ׳.—להיות] Om., as dittog. from l. 4, with 𝔙, Mt. 2^{6}; so Hi., Che., Taylor, Pont, We., Kosters, Gr., GASm., Now., Marti, Siev., Gu., Du., Hpt.. צ׳ להיות is poor Heb.; the correct form would be צ׳ מהי׳.—לי] 𝔖 and Mt. 2^{6} om.; so Stk..—להיות משל] 𝔊^{A} *ἡγούμενος τοῦ εἶναι εἰς ἄρχοντα.*—Mt. 2^{6} renders the last part of verse loosely; *from thee shall come forth a leader who shall shepherd my people Israel.*—**2.** יתנם] 𝔗 has vb. in 3d pers. pl.; 𝔄 in 2d pers. sg. fem..—אחיו] 𝔊 𝔗 𝔄, pl. sf..—על] We., Now., Marti, Stk., Hpt. אל.—**3.** רעה] 𝔊 has a doublet, *ὄψεται καὶ ποιμανεῖ τὸ ποίμνιον αὐτοῦ.* Gr., GASm., Siev., Gu., foll. 𝔊, add an obj., *e. g.* עֶדְרוֹ.—בגאון] 𝔊 = ובגאון.—אלהיו] 𝔊 has pl. sf..—וישבו] Om. as a gloss, or as a dittog. from ישובון in v. ^{2}. 𝔊 *ὑπάρξουσιν*, connecting with v. ^{3a} and omit. ו; so Taylor, Pont, who read vb. as in 𝔐. 𝔙 *convertentur;* so 𝔖 𝔗. One ms. יֵשְׁבוּ; 3 mss. וישובו. Ro. יוּשָׁבוּ. Siev., Stk., and Gu. suppose the loss of some word or phrase modifying ישבו, *e. g.* בְּכֹחַ.—יגדל] 𝔊 pl.. Siev. supposes the loss of the subj., or of an adv..

1. *And thou, Beth Ephrathah*] 𝔐 reads, "Bethlehem Ephrathah"; but "Bethlehem" is a gloss as is shown by 𝔊's rendering and by the metre. The identification with Bethlehem is, however, correct as appears from the reference to Judah in the following line, from the evident allusion of v. ^{1} to the Davidic dynasty which sprang from Bethlehem, and from the way in which Bethlehem and Ephrathah are associated in other passages. The family of David were Ephrathites of Bethlehem Judah (1 S. 17^{12}); Mahlon and Chilion are likewise classified (Ru. 1^2); Ephrathah and Bethlehem are parallel terms in Ru. 4^{11}; 𝔊's version of Jos. 15^{59}, which is generally conceded to represent the original text, identifies Ephrathah and Bethlehem; while 1 Ch. $2^{19.\ 50}$ 4^4 enumerates Bethlehem in a list of Judean towns associated with Caleb and Ephrathah. The only evidence at variance with these facts is furnished by Gn. $35^{16.\ 19}$ 48^7 1 S. 10^2; in Gn. 35^{19} 48^7 Ephrathah is identified with Bethlehem as above, but from Gn. 35^{16} and 1 S. 10^2 it appears that the Ephrathah in question, which was the burial-place of Rachel, was near Bethel and was in the border of Benjamin. Hence we are forced to conclude that there were at least two places named Ephrathah, one in Benjamin and one in Judah, and that the phrase "that is Bethlehem" in Gn. 35^{19} 48^7 is a gloss due to some reader who confused the two places.* The Ephrathah of our text seems to have been the name of a larger district within which Bethlehem was situated, or of the clan to which Bethlehem belonged. On the basis of the existence of an Ephrathah in Benjamin, Oort endeavoured to show that this prophecy had to do with that site and was intended to announce the coming of the Messianic kingdom through the restoration of the downfallen dynasty of Saul,† but upon the exposure of the weakness of this proposition by Kue.,‡ Oort himself abandoned it.§—*The least among the thousands of Judah*] The only possible rendering of 𝔐 is, "little to be among the thousands of Judah," *i. e.* so small that one would hardly have expected to find thee in the number. But grammar and metre combine to recommend the corrected text. The word rendered *clans* is of somewhat doubtful significance as applied to Beth Ephrathah. It ordinarily designates, aside from its strictly numerical usage, either a band of one thousand men under a common leader, or a family. Here and in 1 S. 23^{23} it has either the latter meaning, or else denotes the region or district occupied by an אֶלֶף. It may refer to Ephrathah as the seat of the Davidic clan, which at the time this was written seems to have been reduced to its lowest terms. But in contrast with the present low estate of the family, *from thee one will come forth for me who shall be ruler over Israel*] This implies that at the time of its utterance there was no king over Israel and thus indicates the late origin of this passage *For me, i. e.* in accordance with my purpose and as a result of my plans; the speaker is Yahweh.—*Whose origins are from of old, from ancient days*] *i. e.* he will belong to one of the oldest families, viz. the Davidic; *cf.* Ez. $34^{23 f.}$ $37^{24 f.}$ Ho. 3^{5}. The phrase "from ancient days" (מימי עולם) is of indefinite scope, but is undoubtedly intended to convey the impression of great antiquity; *cf.* Am. 9^{11} Mal. 3^{4}.*—**2.** *Therefore will he give them up until the time when she who is to give birth shall have borne*] The connection of this gloss with the preceding verse is very loose. The thought seems to be thus:—since Yahweh is going to raise up a mighty king for Israel in his own good time, it is clear that the present oppression and suffering are only transitory and will come to an end when the Messiah is born. The change from the first person of v. [1] ("for me") to the third person here is awkward; the failure to define the subject is striking; and the lack of any mention of the antecedents of the pronoun "them" is confusing. The treatment of v. [2] as a marginal note best accounts for these facts. The statement concerning the expected birth is evidently an allusion to Is. 7^{14} and comes from a time when that prophecy was being given Messianic significance. This would point to an age long after the days of Isaiah.†—*And the rest of his brethren will return unto the sons of Israel*] The only proper antecedent for "his" is the promised Messiah. The exile is evidently presupposed, but the exact meaning of the phrase "the rest of his brethren" eludes us. Probably

---

* So *e. g.* Dillmann, Stk., Dr., Addis, Gunkel, Holzinger, Carpenter and Battersby.

† *ThT.* V, 501–512.

‡ *ThT.* VI, 45–66.

§ *ThT.* VI, 273–279.

---

* An interesting analogy is furnished by the "Messianic" passage of Leiden Papyrus, No. 344 [*v.* A. H. Gardiner, *Admonitions of an Egyptian Sage* (1909)], where the "Messiah" is apparently represented as a reincarnation of the god Re and thus can be spoken of as a contemporary of the first generation of mankind; *cf.* JMPS. on *Semitic Prophecy*, *BW*. XXXV (1910), 223–233.

† Stk.'s attempt to maintain Micah's authorship of this passage involves a mythological interpretation of the Messiah as the *Urmensch*, the "days of old" as the age of Paradise, and "the one who is to bear" as the mother of the gods (both here and in Is. 7)—all of which seems far-fetched and fanciful. Much more plausible is the interpretation in the form offered by Gressmann (*Eschatologie*, 270 *ff.*) and Burney (*Journal of Theol. Studies*, X, 580–4), which is to the effect that this prophecy as well as Isaiah's Immanuel oracle rested upon a popular expectation of the advent of a Messianic ruler whose birth should be signalised by some remarkable portent. This passage refers to three phases of the expectation, viz. (1) that the Messiah will be of divine origin having existed in reality or in the mind of God from time immemorial; (2) that whether his fatherhood be human or divine he is to be born of a woman; and (3) that his birth will usher in a new age of peace and prosperity.

We. is right in seeing in it an allusion to the Shear Jashub of Is. 7^3. Perhaps the prophet has in mind the return of all the exiles and their reunion with those who had not been carried away; or again, he may look forward to the reunion of Israel and Judah in the Messianic age; *cf.* Ho. 3^5 Is. $11^{13\,f.}$ Ez. $16^{55.\,61}$ Zc. 8^{13}.—**3.** *And he will stand and shepherd (his flock) in the strength of Yahweh, in the majesty of the name of Yahweh, his God*] The thought of v. ^{1} is here continued. "Stand" is probably used in the sense of "stand firm, steadfast, invincible." His power will emanate, not from the nation over whom he rules, but from God himself. The words "his flock" are not expressed in the Hebrew but are implied in the verb used.—*And they will endure*] This verb, found in 𝔐, seems to be due to a copyist's error, for it is redundant in the metre and, as it stands, yields no satisfactory sense. It is commonly explained as meaning "dwell in safety," but the verb alone never has that meaning. The rendering here adopted is the least difficult; but it is doubtful, since in Ps. 125^1 Jo. 4^{20}, the two passages cited in support of it (BDB.), the meaning "abide," "endure," is conveyed rather by the modifying phrase לְעוֹלָם than by the verb itself. The elimination of this word takes away all occasion for Duhm's transposition of v. ^{3b} to follow v. ^{2} as a continuation of the gloss.—*For now he will be great unto the ends of the earth*] According to 𝔐 this clause furnishes the reason for the security of Israel, viz. the universal acknowledgment of the power of the Messiah. According to the text as here presented, it gives a convincing illustration of the effect of Yahweh's strength as revealed in the Messiah.

1. אֶפְרָתָה] ה loc. with old fem. ending, Ges.$^{§\,90\,g}$; *cf.* עֶזְרָתָה, יְשׁוּעָתָה, etc.. אפ׳ with this spelling occurs also in Ru. 4^{11} Gn. $35^{16.\,19}$ 48^7 Ps. 132^6 1 Ch. $2^{24.\,50}$ 4^4 Jos. 15^{59} 𝔊; but without הָ in Gn. 48^7 1 Ch. 2^{19}. Hence it is better to retain ה in Mi. 5^1 and to regard loss of ה from before צע׳ as due to haplo.. Fr. Schulthess, *ZAW.* XXX, 62 *f.*, following 𝔖 = *'aphărtā*, would preserve 𝔐 intact here, and treat אפ׳ as *epitheton ornans*, related to the Aram. אַפְרָא and Assy. *apparu* which mean 'pasture-land,' 'marsh.' But the character of the region around Bethlehem does not warrant the application of such an epithet, nor can one clear case of the use of this word as an appellative be cited from either Heb., Ar., Syr., Aram. or Assy.. It is equally true, of course, as Schulthess points out, that nothing is known elsewhere of a Beth-Ephrathah, yet the formation of names with 'Beth' is one of the most common.—צָעִיר] Position in sentence is against this being in predicate relation to אתה; better as an appositive. On the adj. with art. as having superlative force, Ges. $^{\S\, 133\, g}$. The masc. form is no indication that Bethlehem is used as representing its people and not as designating a place, for town-names with בית not infrequently take the masc. instead of the fem.; Kö. $^{\S\, 248\, c.\ 249\, c.\ f}$. Nor is it true that צ' applies only to persons (Hal.); *cf.* Dn. 8^9 (of a horn), Je. 49^{20} (of sheep), and the place-name, צָעִירָה, 2 K. 8^{21}.—יצא להיות מושל] It is difficult to make לה' כ' the subj. of יצא (Now., Marti); it is better to assign an indefinite subj. and treat ל' כ' as expressing purpose, *i. e.* "one will come forth to become ruler"; on indef. subj., Ges. $^{\S\, 144\, d}$; on ל with inf. to express purpose, Ges. $^{\S\, 114\, f.\, g}$.—מוֹצָאוֹתָיו] ἁπ. in this sense; but *cf.* Assy. *mûsû*, used *e. g.* of the sources of the Tigris. A nominal clause with relative force; *cf.* Kö. $^{\S\, 362\, p}$.—**2.** יתנם] For meaning "deliver up," *cf.* Ju. 20^{13} 1 S. 11^{12} and BDB. 679b.—עת יולדה] A noun in cstr. rel. with a sentence, equivalent to a noun limited by a temporal clause; *cf.* Ges. $^{\S\, 130\, d.\ 155\, l}$.—יָלָדָה] Fut. pf.; Dr. $^{\S\, 17}$ Ges. $^{\S\, 106\, o}$ Kö. $^{\S\, 129}$.—עַל] = אֶל; *cf.* BDB. 757a; it is unnecessary to change the text. The meaning "along with," "together with," which some prefer here (*e. g.* BDB.), is usually found only where עַל connects closely with a noun (*e. g.* אֵם עַל בָּנִים, Gn. 32^{12}), not where it governs a phrase modifying a vb. as here (so Now.).—ורעה] Not uncommonly used fig. of the activity of a ruler; but only here without an obj. expressed. Assy. *re'u* commonly means "to rule, reign," and ר' here seems to have that force.—עַתָּה] Used of fut. time as in 4^7.

§ 13. *Israel's Protection against Invasion* ($5^{4.\ 5}$).

A ten-line str., the three closing lines of which are almost identical with its three opening lines. When the invader sets foot upon Israelitish soil there will be no lack of valiant leaders to repel him and to carry the war into his own territory. In contrast with the present defenceless, helpless condition, the Israel of the coming golden age will be adequately equipped to defend her own interests.

AND this will be our protection from Assyria:
When he comes into our land,
And when he treads upon our soil,
Then we will raise up against him seven shepherds—
Yea, eight princes of men,
And they will shepherd the land of Assyria with the sword,

And the land of Nimrod with the drawn sword.
And they will rescue from Assyria,
When he comes into our land,
And when he treads upon our border.

The metre of this str. is irregular; ll. 1, 4 and 6 are in tetrameter, the rest in trimeter, though 2 and 9 might be classified as dimeters. L. 6 may have been originally a trimeter, את־ארץ having come in by error from the foll. line; *cf.* 𝔊. Siev.'s attempt to secure four seven-tone lines here involves the omission of the last three words of l. 1 and the insertion of the subj. after יבא in l. 2.

These verses are assigned to Micah by some modern scholars, *e. g.* Volz, GASm., and the specific mention of Assyria seems to settle the question. But the name Assyria is used by later writers, as the name of Israel's first great foreign oppressor, to designate typically later peoples, *e. g.* Babylon (La. 5^{6}), Persia (Ezr. 6^{22}), Syria (Zc. 10^{11} Is. $27^{13\,(?)}$ Ps. $83^{9\,(?)}$). The name Assyria clung to the territory long after the fall of Nineveh; *cf.* the Talmud's name for the Aram. script employed throughout the regions formerly controlled by Assyria, viz. כ־ב אשורי; and Hdt. VII, 63, where the names Assyria and Syria are declared to be synonymous; *v.* Buhl, *Kanon u. Text*, 201. In some such way Assyria is used here. For it is hardly conceivable that Micah could have spoken of the Assyria of his day in the terms employed in v. ^{5}. Nor is the confident, warlike spirit at all compatible with Micah's attitude toward the future and to Assyria in chs. 1–3. The verses seem to reflect later times when the Apocalyptists painted glowing pictures of the future with little reference to present conditions or to the possibility, from a human standpoint, of their ever being realised. Until we know more of historical conditions in Judah during the postexilic period than is now accessible, we need not follow Marti and Gu. in assigning this passage to the Maccabaean age, with which it has no necessary connection, even though the reference of the "seven or eight princes" to Mattathias with his five sons and grandsons is alluring [so Hpt. *Transactions of the Third International Congress for the History of Religions*, I (1908), 268]. In any case it is quite clear that vv. $^{4-5}$ do not belong with vv. $^{1-3}$; for the Messiah who is the dominant figure there is ignored here. Instead of the one great leader, there are here seven or eight, and these are not raised up by the Messiah but by the populace. Moreover, whereas in v. ^{3} the rule of the Messiah is to extend unbroken to the ends of the earth, here we find "Assyria" invading the territory of Israel. The point of view is thus distinctly different from that in vv. $^{1-3}$. *Cf.* van H., who treats vv. $^{4.\,5a}$ as a gloss; and Du. who considers vv. $^{4b.\,5a}$ a gloss upon the word "Assyria" in v. ^{5b}, while vv. $^{4a.\,5b}$ form a four-line str. belonging to $5^{1.\,3}$.

4. זה] 𝔖 om..—שלום] Schnurrer, שְׁלוֹם; so Laufer, Gautier. Siev. שְׁלוֹם. Siev. and Gu. eliminate the phrase זה של׳ אש׳, as a superscription which has been mistakenly incorporated in the body of the poem.—

אשור] Rd. מֵאַשּׁוּר, the loss of מ from 𝔐 being due to haplo.. For שָׁלוֹם מִן = *protection from*, *v.* Zc. 8^{10} Jb. 21^{9}. Taylor tr. to foll. יבא, regarding the position in 𝔐 as due to influence of the order in v. ^{5}; *cf.* Siev.'s insertion of אשור in the same place mtr. cs..—בארצנו] 𝔊 2d pl. masc. sf. and in v. ^{5}.—בארמנותינו] Rd. בְּאַדְמָתֵנוּ, foll. 𝔊 *ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν ὑμῶν*; so Ro., Ry., Pont, Elh., Gu., Now., Oort$^{Em.}$, Hal., Siev., Hpt.. We., GASm. בגבולנו, as in v. ^{5}.—הקמנו] 𝔊 *ἐπεγερθήσονται* = הֻקְמוּ.—נסיכי] 𝔊 *δήγματα*, connecting it with נָשַׁךְ, to *bite*.—אדם] Gr. אדמה.—**5.** ורעו] Gr. וְרָעוּ.—את ארץ אשור] 𝔊 *τὸν Ἀσσούρ*.—בפתחיה] Rd. בַּפְּתִיחָה; so Taylor, Pont, Now., van H., Du., Hpt.. 𝔊 *ἐν τῇ τάφρῳ αὐτῆς*. 𝔙 *in lanceis ejus;* so Aq. Ε′. 𝔖 *in his wrath*. Ro. בִּפְתִיחֶיהָ. Gr. and Marti, בִּפְתִיחוֹתֶיהָ. Hi. בִּפְתָחוֹת; so Elh., Gu., Oort$^{Em.}$, Marti.—והציל] Rd. וְהִצִּילוּ; so Elh., Gu., Now., Siev.. Ro. וְהַצִּיל. Oort$^{Em.}$ לְהַצִּילֵנוּ. Hal. וְהֻצַּל. We. וְהִצִּילוּנוּ (so Marti), or וְהִצִּילָנוּ. J. Herrmann, in *OLZ.* XIV (1911), 203, suggests that v.^{5b}, והציל וגו׳, was a true correction of v.^{4a}, which should read והיה זה שלום וְהִצִּיל מֵאַשּׁוּר וגו׳. The correction was placed on the margin alongside of the error and finally came into the text in the wrong place. This is plausible; but the use of שלום is difficult and the Messiah seems superfluous alongside of the "princes of men."

4. *And this will be the protection from Assyria*] 𝔐 is usually rendered, "and such shall be our peace. Assyria, etc"; but the connection thereby established is very harsh and abrupt. By some, the first words are connected with vv. $^{1-3}$ and rendered, "and such an one shall be our peace." * But the description of the Messiah as abstract 'peace' is unusual. The translation here adopted furnishes an admirable sense in this connection and involves only the slightest textual change. *This* refers to the following, not the preceding context. *Assyria* stands as representative of the great world-tyrant of the time, whether Babylon, Persia, or Syria (*v. s.*).—*When he comes into our land, and when he treads upon our soil*] The invasion is not conceived of as a remote possibility, but rather as an event likely to occur and therefore needing to be reckoned with.—*Seven shepherds, yea—eight princes of men*] This collocation of two numbers, the second being greater than the first by a unit, is employed to express the idea of indefiniteness; *cf.* H.^{AH}, 21.† The supply of leaders will be equal to all demands that may be made. *Shepherds* and *princes of men* are equivalent terms, both designating military leaders; *cf.* Jos. 13^{21}.—**5.** *And they will shepherd*] *i. e. in sensu malo*, exercise punitive power over her.—*The land of Assyria and the land of Nimrod*] "Nimrod" is chosen as a synonym for "Assyria," perhaps, because of its suggestion of the root *marad*, "to rebel." The only other references to Nimrod (Gn. 10^{8-11} 1 Ch. 1^{16}) show that the whole Babylonian-Assyrian empire was classified as the territory of Nimrod, the founder of Babylon.—*And they will rescue from Assyria*] 𝔐 "he will rescue," referring to the Messiah of vv. $^{1-3}$; but this ignores all the intervening context. Van H.'s solution of the difficulty by dropping this context as a later addition is too drastic treatment. The whole progress of thought here requires the plural.

---

* So Ki., Ro., Or.. The application of זה to the Messiah began with Ki..

† The view of Gressmann, *Eschat.* 284, that seven and eight are to be added together yielding fifteen, which is the number of Ishtar (*KAT.*^{3}, 454) the goddess-mother of the Messiah, can only be counted among the curiosities of the history of interpretation.

4. זֶה] Eerdmans, *ThT*. XLI (1907), 502, would give זה here the meaning of Ar. *dzu*, lord of; but this rendering is necessary nowhere else, not even in Ju. 5^5; nor does it belong to the Syr., Aram., and Eth. equivalents.—ארמנותינו] is hardly appropriate here. The prophet is picturing a condition when the enemy will never be permitted to do more than cross the border; entrance of the *palaces* is out of the question; *cf.* v. ^{5} and 𝔊 𝔖.—נסיכי אדם] *i. e.* "princely men"; *cf.* Pr. 15^{20} כְּסִיל א׳, "a foolish man"; *cf.* Ges. $^{\S\,128l}$.—**5.** פְּתָחֶיהָ] *i. e.* "in its entrances," establishing a blockade; or "in its passes," pursuing the fugitives to their mountain fastnesses. But the parall. calls for a weapon; hence it is better to read some form of פְּתִיחָה, *drawn sword*, as suggested by Aq. E′ and 𝔙.

§ 14. *The Divine Emergence and Irresistible Might of the Remnant* (5^{6-8}).

Two strs. of six lines each, in trimeter movement, set forth the glory of the remnant, as exhibited in its marvellous rise to power and in its victorious career. V. ^{8} is a marginal note on v. ^{7} (*v. i.*). **Str. I** likens the emergence of the remnant, from among the nations whither Israel has been scattered, to the silently falling dew and to the showers which enable the grass to grow independently of human aid. **Str. II** presents the remnant under the figure of a roaring lion, ravaging defenceless flocks of sheep with none to say him nay.

AND the remnant of Jacob will be among the nations,
In the midst of many peoples,
Like the dew from Yahweh,
Like the showers upon the herbage,
Which waits not for man,
Nor tarries for the children of men.
YEA, the remnant of Jacob will be among the nations,
In the midst of many peoples,
Like the lion among the beasts of the forest,
Like the young lion among the flocks of sheep,
Who, if he pass over,
Tramples and tears, with none to deliver.

This piece is quite generally denied to Micah. In contrast to the prophecy of the eighth century, its interests are not in the present but exclusively in the future. The *diaspora* is a familiar idea and has attained wide extent. The remnant is no longer the weak handful of Isaiah, but is endowed with invincible might, none can stand before it. There is no connection between this passage and vv. $^{4.\,5}$; there Israel occupies its own territory whence it repels the invader; here Israel is scattered among the nations of the world. Nor does it connect with the following context; for while Israel is the victorious avenger over the nations here, in vv. $^{9\,\text{ff.}}$ Israel becomes the victim of Yahweh's punitive wrath. This passage thus, like vv. $^{4.\,5}$, is a fragment entirely independent of the surrounding context. Not only so, but v. ^{8} is very loosely connected with vv. $^{6.\,7}$, and is best considered as a marg. n. on v. ^{7} (so Siev., Gu., Hpt.); *v. i.*. *Cf.* Du. who puts 5^{8} between $4^{13\,a}$ and $4^{13\,b}$. Some also would separate v. ^{7} from v. ^{6}, on the basis that the two verses present diametrically opposite aspects of Israel's activity; so Ladame, Hal., Stk.; but this is dependent upon the interpretation given to v. ^{6}; *v. i.*.

The symmetry of form between v. ^{6} and v. ^{7} is noticeable; the first two lines of each are identical, the third and fourth contain similes in both cases, and the fifth and sixth a relative clause. It results from this that the series of consonants opening the successive lines is the same in both strs., viz. ו, ו, א, כ, כ, ב. Such resemblance may, of course, be due to identity of authorship, or to imitation, though the latter is less likely than the former.

It is difficult to fix the time of the origin of this section within any narrow limits. The only certain basis for a date is furnished by the extent of the *diaspora* herein reflected and the idea of the remnant that dominates the whole passage. The wide scattering of Israel "among the nations, in the midst of many peoples" would seem to call for a date after the fall of Jerusalem in 586; while the conception of the irresistible might of the remnant as the representative of God among the peoples points to a time later than Deutero-Isaiah and the return from captivity. The only *terminus ad quem* available is furnished by the close of the prophetic canon. But there is nothing in the content of the passage that makes it necessary to come down so far for the origin of this prophecy. It might well belong to the middle or latter part of the Persian period.

6. יַעֲקֹב] Add בַּגּוֹיִם, with 𝔊 𝔖, cod. Kenn. 154 and v. [7]; so Ro., Elh., Pont, Gu., Now., Siev., van H.. Oort^Em. adds בתוך הגוים.—בקרב ע׳ ר׳] Siev. om. here (so Stk.) and in v. [7] mtr. cs., as a gloss.—כרביבים] 𝔊 ὡς ἄρνες. All Vrss. and many Heb. mss. prefix ו here and before ככפיר in v. [7].—יקוה] 𝔊 συναχθῇ = יִקָּוֶה.—לבני אדם] Siev. om. mtr. cs..—**7.** יַעַר] 𝔖 *of the flock*.—בְּעֶדְרֵי] 𝔖 sg..—**8.** תרם] Rd. תָּרֹם, with 𝔊; so We., Now., Oort^Em., Marti, Siev. (?); *cf.* 35 codd. (Kenn.) תרום. Hal. תָּרִים.

Str. I expresses the conviction that Yahweh himself will bring Israel to her rightful place of power.—**6.** *And the remnant of Jacob will be among the nations, in the midst of many peoples*] "Jacob" is used as representing the people of Yahweh as a whole, not those of northern Israel, nor those of Judah merely. The exile and scattering of the people are presupposed either as an existing fact, or as conceived of in the prophet's mind; the former is the more natural interpretation; *v. s.*. The use of the term "remnant" is parallel to that in 4^7, another late passage.—*Like the dew from Yahweh, like the showers upon the herbage*] Opinions vary as to the exact point of the comparison here. Is it in the suddenness of the fall of the dew? Just so suddenly shall Israel fall upon its foes and smite them.* This furnishes a sense in harmony with the unmistakable meaning of v. [7]. Or is it that Israel in the Messianic age will be as innumerable as the drops of dew and rain? † Or again, is it found in the refreshing influence of the dew to which Israel's moral and religious influence among the nations is parallel? ‡ This, however, yields a sense for v. [6] entirely at variance with that of v. [7], for Israel which is here a blessing is clearly there an agent of destruction. Or yet again, is it in the divine origin of the dew and rain, which are wholly independent of human aid? § So will be Israel's rise to power over the nations. Or finally, must we confess our inability to discover the meaning? ** The key to the meaning of the simile seems to be given by the following clause, viz. *which waits not for man, nor tarries for the children of men*] The antecedent of the pronoun is not the dew nor the rain,* but the herbage† (*v. i.*). The force of the comparison thus appears to be that just as the dew and rain falling upon the grass cause it to grow and render it independent of human irrigation, so through the favour and might of Yahweh the remnant of Israel among the nations will rise to power, notwithstanding the absence of all human help. Israel's future depends solely upon Yahweh.

---

* So Hi..

† So Now., Hpt..

‡ So Stk..

§ So *e. g.* Casp., Ke., Now., Marti, Hpt..

** So We..

Str. II goes on to say that this divinely produced remnant will overthrow all opposition.—**7.** *Like the lion among the beasts of the forest, the young lion among the flocks of sheep*] Wild beasts and domestic animals alike are defenceless before the lion; so will Israel's power be supreme among the nations.—*Who, whenever he passes through, tramples and rends, with none to deliver*] A picture of wanton destruction on the one hand, and utter defencelessness on the other.—The two strs. thus interpreted fit together excellently, the second taking up the description where the first drops it. There is not the slightest necessity for segregating v. ^{7}.—Fired by this vision of triumph, some reader added the patriotic and pious comment constituting v. **8.**—*Thy hand will be high above thine enemies and all thy foes will be cut off*] 𝔐's "may thy hand, etc." is improbable, since what is declared to be an assured fact in v. ^{7} would hardly be prayed for in v. ^{8}, unless the latter were wholly unrelated to the former. Interpreters have always differed as to the person addressed, some holding it to be Yahweh,‡ others the remnant.§ The biblical usage of such phraseology as "thy hand is high" may be cited for either interpretation; *cf.* Is. 26^{11} Ps. 89^{14} Nu. 33^{3} Dt. 32^{27} Ex. 14^{8}. But a closer connection with v. ^{7} is obtained by taking the words as addressed to the remnant. For similar sentiments, *cf.* Is. $49^{25\text{ f.}}$ 60^{12} Zc. $14^{17\text{ f.}}$ Ps. $149^{6\text{ f.}}$.

6. שארית] Treated as masc. (*cf.* sf. in v. ^{8}), since the term is thought of as practically identical with nation and people.—אשר לא יקוה] Syntax may be satisfied here in either of four ways, (1) rel. clause with antecedent עשב; (2) rel. clause with antecedent טל, רביבים being regarded as subordinate or parenthetical; (3) rel. clause with antecedent רביבים, but

---

* So Ew., Hi., Hd., Ke., Casp., Kl., Or., Now., Marti, *et al.*.

† So Bauer, Theiner, Rosenm., Ro., van H., *et al.*.

‡ So *e. g.* Mau., Hd..

§ So *e. g.* Rosenm., Ew., Ke., Kl., Ro., Or., Now., Marti.

number of vb. is determined by עשב the nearest noun; (4) an explanatory clause stating the content of the resemblance, viz. "the remnant shall be, etc. . . . in that it shall not wait, etc."; *cf.* 𝕲. But (1) yields the smoothest structure.—**7.** אם עבר ור'] Regular form for a condition pointing to "any time in the indefinite or more or less remote future," Dr. $^{\S 138}$.—**8.** Fine chiasm.

§ 15. *Israel's Purification through Chastisement* (5^{9-14}).

This piece consists of two four-line strs., with an introductory prose line (v. ^{9a}) and two additional verses from the hands of editors (vv. $^{13.\ 14}$). The original piece probably dates from some time in the Deuteronomic period. **Str. I** foretells the destruction of the munitions of war in which Israel places confidence instead of trusting in Yahweh. **Str. II** denounces idolatrous practices which likewise lead Israel away from Yahweh.

And it will come to pass in that day, it is the oracle of Yahweh:
I WILL cut off thy horses from the midst of thee,
And I will destroy thy chariots.
And I will cut off the cities of thy land,
And I will lay waste all thy fortresses.
AND I will cut off sorceries from thy hand,
And thou wilt have no soothsayers.
And I will cut off thine images and thy pillars from the midst of thee,
And thou wilt no more bow down to the work of thine own hands.

The assonance of the poem is noticeable, especially the repetition of והכרתי and the suffix ךָ. The movement is trimeter except in the last two lines where a heavier metre appears. Siev. recognises this change in v. ^{12}, and therefore inserts כל in v. ^{12a} in order to secure six beats. But v. ^{12b} cannot be made over thus, hence it is athetized from vv. $^{9-12a}$ and with v. ^{13} is constituted another fragment. But v. ^{12b} is the climax of the poem and the only natural stopping-place. Du. refuses any poetic form to vv. $^{9-14}$ and prints the entire passage as plain prose.

That v. ^{14} has no connection with vv. $^{9-13}$ has long been recognised; so We., Now., Ladame, Siev.. It introduces a wholly new subject, viz. Yahweh's vengeance upon the heathen, whereas vv. $^{9-13}$ are concerned with Israel exclusively. The fact that the vengeance is to be executed upon the nations at large points to a relatively late origin. Early prophecy did not contemplate the conversion of the world to Yahweh, hence did not denounce the nations for disobedience to him. Its indignation was expended upon the particular nation which was oppressing Israel at any given time.

The grounds for setting aside v. ^{13} are no less cogent. V. ^{13b}, as it stands in 𝕸, is a weak repetition of v. ^{10a}; and if the common correction of עריך to עֲצַבֶּיךָ be accepted the case is no better, for ^{13b} then becomes superfluous after v. ^{12}. V. ^{13a} likewise is an editorial insertion, giving an additional detail, which has no place after the summary in v. ^{12}; anything additional weakens the effect. Hpt., however, athetizes vv. $^{10.\ 12.\ 13}$ leaving vv. $^{9.\ 11.\ 14}$ as the original material.

The date of vv. $^{9-12}$ has been a subject of debate for some years. Sta. (*ZAW.* I, 161–72), Cor. (*ZAW.* IV, 88 *f.*; *Intr.* 342), Kosters (*ThT.* XXVII, 249–274), Marti, Bu.$^{\text{Gesch.}}$, 86 *f.*, *et al.*, deny the passage to Micah and place it somewhere in the exilic or postexilic periods. Kue. (*Einl.* II, 360–3) and Che. (*EB.* art. *Micah*) suppose that it originated with Micah, but was thoroughly worked over in the postexilic age. Many scholars, however, still maintain Micah's authorship; so *e. g.* We., Ry., GASm., Volz, Now., Wildeboer, Ladame, van H., and apparently Dr..

The argument against an early date is best presented by Marti, viz. (1) that the *maṣṣeboth* and *asherim* were not denounced by Hosea and Isaiah, nor until the promulgation of Deuteronomy, which shows that they were not eliminated by Hezekiah's reform; (2) that the joint condemnation of munitions of war and idolatrous practices is a late characteristic, as are also the combination of *pesilim* and *maṣṣeboth*, and the allusion to the existence of fortresses; (3) that parallel passages are of later origin, viz. Ho. 2^{20} 8^{14} 14^{4}; and (4) that the lack of any allusion to "high-places" is as easily accounted for on the hypothesis of origin after these were all destroyed, as it is on the supposition of origin before the movement against them had developed. When to all this is added the consideration that weighs as heavily here as in the case of 1^{7}, viz. that a polemic against idolatry lies outside of the range of Micah's thought, the argument seems convincing.

Yet, on the other hand, though Amos, Hosea and Isaiah did not denounce *maṣṣeboth* and *asherim* specifically, the polemic against images was taken up by Hosea (8^{4-6} 10^{5} 13^{2}). Horses and chariots are coupled with idolatrous images by Isaiah (2^{7}; *cf.* 30^{16} 31^{1}), as hostile to complete faith in Yahweh as Israel's only defence. Furthermore, the Deuteronomic prohibition of *maṣṣeboth* must have been prepared for by the teachings of the preceding prophets. Law is but the codification of an already existing sentiment or custom. Finally, the excision of 1^{7} does not necessarily carry with it the dropping of this section, for 1^{7} clearly is in no close relation to its context and carries the stamp of an addition even apart from its context.

On the whole, therefore, it seems probable that 5^{9-12} is of late origin; but the possibility must remain open that it is a genuine fragment of Micah and represents to us a phase of his teaching not otherwise recorded.

9. והאבדתי] Siev. adds כל־, mtr. cs..—**11.** כשפים] 𝔊 = כשפיך, confusing מ and כ; *cf.* p. 32.—מירך] 𝔊 𝔖 = מידיך.—**12.** וּמַצֵּבוֹתֶיךָ] 𝔖 = *thy high-places*, or *altars; cf.* 𝔊 *θυσιαστηρίου* in Ho. 3^4.—מַעֲשֵׂה] 𝔊 pl..—**13.** אשיריך] 𝔊 *the groves* = אשירים, again confusing כ and מ. 𝔖 *thy plants.*—עריך] 𝔗 *thine enemies, i. e.* צריך; so also Che., Elh.. Hi. ערעריך (*thy tamarisks*). Krenkel (*ZwTh.* IX, 275), פְּעָרֶיךָ. Van H. עציך (*thy trees*). Stei. עֲצַבֶּיךָ; so Kosters, Gr., Gu., Now., Marti, Siev., Du.; *cf.* 2 Ch. 24^{18}.—**14.** אשר לא וגו'] 𝔊 *ἀνθ' ὧν οὐκ κ.τ.λ.* 𝔙 *quae non, etc.*; so 𝔖.

Str. I threatens Israel with the destruction of every source of human confidence and help.—**9.** *And it will come to pass in that day, it is the oracle of Yahweh*] An introductory statement in prose. The last phrase occurs again only in 4^6, a late passage; it is common in Amos.—*That I will cut off thy horses, etc.*] A similar prophecy in Zc. 9^{10}; *cf.* Dt. 17^{16} 20^1 Ho. 14^4.—**10.** *And I will cut off the cities of thy land and lay waste all thy fortresses*] The mention of fortified cities is hardly sufficient warrant for placing the prophecy in the Maccabaean age as Marti does; *cf.* Ho. 10^{14} Am. 5^9 Is. 17^3 22^{10} 25^{12} 34^{13} 2 Ch. 11^{11} 26^9. Sennacherib (Taylor Cylinder) testifies to the large number of cities in Judah; "but as for Hezekiah of Judah, who had not submitted to my yoke, forty-six of his strong walled cities, and the smaller cities round about them, without number, . . . I besieged and captured." Though Yahweh will destroy all Israel's means of defence, it is not to leave her defenceless; he himself will be her strength and shield. But she must be brought to realise her absolute dependence upon him.

Str. II declares that Yahweh will destroy all supposed sources of divine help other than himself so that Israel may come to see their futility.—**11.** *Sorceries*] The exact content of this term is uncertain; it is apparently a general designation of all sorts of magical rites.—*Soothsayers*] This is an equally obscure word; it probably denotes those who practise various arts of divination. Both sorcerers and diviners alike totally fail to realise the true and only way to communion with God.—**12.** *Thine images and thy pillars*] Graven images are meant, such as were common in early Israel (*cf.* Ju. $17^{3.4}$ Ho. 11^2 Is. 10^{10} 21^9 Je. 10^{14}), and continued in exilic and postexilic times (Is. 30^{22} 48^5), but were prohibited by all three codes (Ex. 20^4 Dt. 12^3 Lv. 26^1). The "pillars" were consecrated stones set up beside altars and at graves or as boundary-stones, and originally supposed to serve as the residence of deity; *cf.* Gn. 28^{18} $31^{13.\ 45}$ $35^{14.\ 20}$ Ex. 24^{4}. They were a common Semitic institution, having been found at Gezer, at Petra, in Cyprus, and having existed also among Phœnicians and Arabs. They were first prohibited by the Deuteronomic Code, Dt. 16^{22}; but remained in good standing as legitimate elements in the Yahweh-cultus long after in the minds of many; *cf.* Is. $19^{19.\ 20}$, a late passage.—*And thou wilt not bow down any more to the work of thy hands*] This does away at one stroke with all idolatrous worship of images. Notwithstanding the prohibition in the Decalogue, the prophets found it necessary to wage unceasing war upon image-cults; *cf.* Ho. 13^{2} 2 K. 23^{14} Ez. $8^{3.\ 5.\ 12}$ Is. 44^{9-20}.

To v. ^{12} has been attached a gloss, or marginal note, supplementing the statement there made.—**13.** *And I will uproot thine asherim from the midst of thee*] The *asherah* was a sacred wooden post that constituted a part of the equipment of the place of worship, both among the Canaanites (Ex. 34^{13} Ju. 6^{25}) and the Hebrews (2 K. 23^{6} Is. 17^{8}), perhaps taken over by the latter from the former. They were forbidden by the Deuteronomic Code (Dt. 7^{5} 12^{3} 16^{21}; *cf.* Ex. 34^{13}, in a late stratum of J); but, like the accompanying "pillars," they survived the prohibition for some time (*cf.* Je. 17^{2} Is. 27^{9}). The precise nature of their origin and function are not yet known.—*And I will destroy thy cities*] This adds nothing to v.^{10a}; hence it is emended by many to "thine idols," but this is vain repetition of v. ^{12}. In either case, it is more easily assigned to a glossator than to the author of vv. $^{9-12}$.—Taylor reconstructs vv. $^{12.\ 13}$ thus: "I will cut off thine images and thy pillars, and I will uproot thine *asherim* from the midst of thee, and thou wilt no more bow down to the work of thy hands," omitting the last word of ^{12a}, inserting ^{13a} after ^{12a}, and dropping ^{13b}. This furnishes good progress of thought and preserves the proper climax, but it destroys the symmetry of **Str. II** and makes no real contribution to its content.

14. *And I will execute vengeance, in anger and wrath, upon the nations which have not hearkened*] An addition by an editor who was unwilling that a prophecy denouncing Israel's idolatry should close without a word of condemnation upon the great idolatrous, heathen world. The only way of escape for the nations is to submit themselves to Yahweh and his people, putting away their own gods; the failure to do this arouses Yahweh's anger and involves their total destruction. Yahweh will be satisfied with nothing less than a world-wide kingdom.

11. כשפים] Only here and 2 K. 9[22] Is. 47[9] Na. 3[4]. כִּשֵּׁף in Assy. = *to practice magic*; in Ar. *to cut*; *cf.* Syr. in Ethpe. = *to pray* (*i. e. cut oneself*; *cf.* 1 K. 18[28]). Zim. (*KAT.*^{3}, 605, 650) maintains that it is a loan-word from Assy; but it is not likely that a word of this kind known in Ar., Assy. and Syr. would not be current in Heb., designating as it does a common Semitic custom. Furthermore, the vb. occurs in Ex. 22[17] which antedates the Assy. period of Heb. history.—מעוננים] Forbidden in Dt. 18[10]; but mentioned in Je. 27[9] Is. 57[3]. Exact function, and the orig. mean. of root are unknown; *cf.* 𝔊 *ἀποφθεγγόμενοι*; Aq. *κληδονιζόμενοι*; Σ, *σημειοσκοπούμενοι*; 𝔖 *diviners*, or *necromancers*. *Cf.* Ju. 9[37].—**13.** אשיריך] Full writing of ֵ—; so also in Dt. 7[5] 2 K. 17[16]; *cf.* זקינינו, Jos. 9[11]. On relation to the Canaanitish goddess *Aširtu* or *Ašratu*, *v.* refs. in BDB., *HWB.*^{15} and *EB.* 331.—עָרֶיךָ] Various meanings have been proposed in order to avoid repetition of v. [10a], *e. g. enemies* (𝔗, Ra., Ki., Cal., Ro.); *sacred forests* (of Ar. origin; Theiner, Mich.); *witnesses*, used of trees, pillars, etc., as signs of altars (reading ד for ר; so Hi.).—**14.** עשיתי . . . נקם] The construction is unusual in that the noun as obj. is so far removed from its vb., and is unique in that ע' נ' is followed by את־ with the acc. of the person upon whom vengeance is executed; *i. e.* the compound expression is treated like the simple vb. נָקַם; *cf.* Jos. 10[13] Lv. 19[18].—אשר] Better treated as rel. part. with antecedent הגוים than as causal part., or as rel. with antecedent נקם, *i. e. vengeance such* as, etc.

C. CHAPTERS 6 AND 7.

That these two chapters as they stand could not belong to the eighth century B.C. has been generally recognised since the days of Ewald. Opinion has been divided however as to the time to which they do belong. Ew., followed by many interpreters, assigned them to the reign of Manasseh as a product of Micah's old age. Recent scholarship has been more inclined to place them in the postexilic period. In any case they do not constitute a logical unit, but must be interpreted as representing different points of view and reflecting varying backgrounds. For detailed discussion of these questions reference is made to the Introduction, § 2, and to the introductory statements at the opening of the various sections into which the chapters are here analysed.

§ 16. *Yahweh's Controversy with Israel* (6^{1-5}).

Four strs. of four trimeter lines each, seek to bring home to the conscience of Israel the obligation resting upon her to be loyal to Yahweh in return for his great goodness to her. **Str. I.** Let Israel in the presence of the mountains present her case. **Str. II.** Let these mountains "full of memories and associations with both parties to the trial" be witnesses in the controversy between Yahweh and his people. **Str. III.** Yahweh has given Israel cause not for complaint but for thanksgiving; witness, the deliverance from Egypt. **Str. IV.** Let Israel only recall the period of the wanderings in the desert, in order to be reminded of the mighty interpositions of Yahweh in her behalf.

HEAR, now, the word
Which Yahweh has spoken:
Arise, plead unto the mountains,
And let the hills hear thy voice.
HEAR, O mountains, the controversy of Yahweh;
Yea, give ear, O foundations of the earth;
For Yahweh has a controversy with his people;
Yea, with Israel he will enter into argument.
MY people, what have I done to thee?
And wherein have I wearied thee? Answer me.
For I brought thee up from the land of Egypt,
And from the house of bondage I rescued thee.
MY people, what did Balak counsel?
And what did Balaam answer him?
Remember, now, "from Shittim to Gilgal,"
That thou mayest know the righteous deeds of Yahweh.

The poetic form of this piece has been fairly well preserved by 𝔐. It is necessary only to add a word in ^{1a}, with 𝔊; to eliminate ^{4c} as a gloss; to transpose זכר־נא from ^{5a} to ^{5c}; and to omit מלך מ׳ from ^{5a} and בן בעור from ^{5b}. The rhythm then becomes smooth and harmonious.

Marti, Siev., and Gu. om. v. ^{5} as a historical expansion; but it constitutes an excellent close for this phase of the thought and it conforms to the metric and strophic norm. The change from 1st pers. (v. ^{5a}) to 3d pers. (v. ^{5d}) is too common in Heb. prophetic utterance to serve as valid reason for athetizing the verse in which it occurs. Du., however, treats both vv. $^{4.5}$ (and Hpt. vv. $^{4c.5}$) as a later prose expansion. But this leaves vv. $^{1-3}$ hanging in the air.

The contents of vv. $^{1-5}$ furnish slight evidence of any specific date for their origin. In themselves, the verses might belong to almost any period of prophecy. Du., indeed, assigns vv. $^{1-3}$ to Micah, together with the most of ch. 6. But the fact that in chs. 1–3 the religious and political leaders were the objects of denunciation as leading the people astray, while here the people as a whole is reproved, points to different authorship. Moreover, the presence of this passage in this context and in the collection of oracles making up chs. 6 and 7 is a sign of late origin.

שמעו וגו׳] Siev. om. vv. $^{1a.b.2a.b}$ as superscriptions forming no part of the poem.—נא] 𝔙 om..—את] Add, with 𝔊, הַדָּבָר; so one ms. of Kenn., Marti, Now.^{K}, Gu..—אשר יהוה] 𝔊^{B} *κύριος κύριος*. 𝔊$^{A.26.126}$ *κυρίου ἃ ὁ κύριος*.—אמר] Rd. אָמַר, with 𝔊 *εἶπεν*; so Marti, Now.^{K}, Gu..—את] Rd. אֶל, with 𝔊 *πρός*, and 𝔙 *adversum;* so Hi., Stei., We., Gr., Now., Oort$^{Em.}$, Marti, Siev., Du., Gu..—**2**. הרים] 𝔊 *λαοί*; 𝔊^{AQ} *βουνοί*.—והאתנים] Rd. וְהַאֲזִינוּ, with We.; so BDB., Or., Now., Oort$^{Em.}$, Marti, Hal., Siev., Gu., Du., Hpt.. ז and ח were sufficiently alike to be easily confused in the old script; while ם arose through dittog. of foll. מ. Presence of art. with את, though lacking from הרים, makes 𝔐 suspicious. 𝔊 *αἱ φάραγγες* (*mountain clefts*); similarly 𝔖. 𝔙 *fortia*. *Cf*. Elh. שמעו את־ריב י׳ הררי האתנים.—**3**. ומה הלאתיך] 𝔊 *ἢ τί ἐλύπησά σε ἢ τί παρηνώχλησά σοι*, a double rendering.—**4**. אחרון] 𝔊 𝔖 𝔙 = וא׳.—**5**. זכר־נא] Tr. to precede מן השטים in v. ^{5c}; this renders ^{5a} parallel in structure to the corresponding line of Str. III, and also makes ^{5c} susceptible of sensible interpretation. *Cf*. Hi. who would repeat זכר־נא before מן־הש׳.—מה יעץ] 𝔊 adds *κατὰ σοῦ*; so 𝔖.—מלך מואב] Om. mtr. cs., with Now.^{K} and Siev.; so also בן בעור.—מן השטים] 𝔊 *ἀπὸ τῶν σχοίνων* (= *rushes*), perhaps an error for *σχίνων* (= *mastich trees;* so Vol., Ry.). Mau. prefixes ומה עשיתי; so Taylor, Elh.. Stei. prefixes ועברך. Ew. om. the whole phrase as a gloss; so Du., GASm., Now., Gu., *et al*..—צדקות] 𝔊 𝔖 sg..

Str. I calls the world's attention to the message of Yahweh intrusted to the prophet.—**1.** *Hear, now, the word which Yahweh has spoken*] The prophet thus introduces Yahweh to the people. —*Arise, plead unto the mountains, and let the hills hear thy voice*] Yahweh now speaks to the prophet. The mountains have witnessed the whole course of Israel's history, including the benefits showered upon the nation and the base ingratitude returned. These, therefore, may be regarded as just judges concerning the righteousness or unrighteousness of Yahweh's case as presented through the prophet. The mountains and hills are not introduced here merely for rhetorical effect. It is a part of the prophetic doctrine that the animate and inanimate world are alike concerned in God's dealings. Besides the conception of nature as a witness, represented here, we find also that of nature "as sharing God's feeling of the intolerableness of the evil which men have heaped upon her, or by her droughts and floods and earthquakes as the executioner of their doom" (GASm., p. 420). *Cf.* Rom. 8[22].

Str. II represents the prophet, in obedience to Yahweh's behest, addressing himself to the hills with a request for their attention to the statement of Yahweh's case.—**2.** *Hear, O mountains, the controversy of Yahweh*] The prophet now speaks, turning himself to the mountains. The figure in the prophet's mind is that of a case in court; Yahweh is the plaintiff, Israel the defendant, the mountains serve as judge and jury, and the prophet is the plaintiff's counsel.—*Yea, give ear, O foundations of the earth*] 𝔐 reads, "and ye, the everlasting ones, the foundations of the earth!". But this is a clumsily constructed phrase, and is also subject to serious criticism on linguistic and grammatical grounds (*v. i.*). The "foundations" are identical with the "mountains" in the parallel line, which were thought of as the pillars upon which the earth was supported; *cf.* Dt. 32[22] Ps. 18[8] Jb. 18[4] 𝔊.—*For Yahweh has a controversy with his people; yea, with Israel he will enter into argument*] The phrase "his people" involves the acknowledgment of a special relation between Yahweh and Israel, indicates the ground upon which Yahweh bases his right to enter into argument, and suggests the many mercies already extended to Israel by Yahweh. The appeal here, as always in prophecy, is made to the intelligence and reason of Israel; *cf.* Ho. 4[1. 6] 12[2] Is. 1[18 ff.] Je. 25[31]. The prophet's recourse is not to authority, nor to fanatical emotion, but to the self-evidencing power of truth and undeniable fact.

In **Str. III** Yahweh speaks and makes his appeal to Israel's history for vindication of his right to be grieved.—**3.** *My people, what have I done to thee? And wherein have I wearied thee? Answer me*] The tone is full of entreaty. The inquiry is that of a parent, not that of a judge or king. The implication is that Israel's attitude toward Yahweh is such as would be justifiable only on the basis of unkind or unjust treatment on the part of Yahweh. But Yahweh declares that he is not conscious of any intention to injure Israel and challenges her to cite any incident in her history that will convict him of wrong. He has made no unreasonable, oppressive demands upon his people (*cf.* Is. 43^{23}). He calls upon Israel to defend herself by justifying her implied charges against him. No answer comes to the question, for none can be made.—**4a, b.** *For I brought thee up from the land of Egypt and from the house of bondage I rescued thee*] Not only has Yahweh given Israel no occasion for complaint, but she has every reason for gratitude. The first and most fundamental fact in Yahweh's long record of gracious deeds is the deliverance from Egypt. Israel's history, as understood by the prophets, begins with an act of redemption (Am. 2^{10} 3^1 9^7 Ho. 2^{15} 11^1 $12^{9.\ 13}$ 13^4 Je. 2^6 $7^{22.\ 25}$ $11^{4.\ 7}$ Ez. $20^{5\ f.}$ Is. 11^{16} 52^4 63^{11}). This event lies so deep in the national consciousness and is referred to so frequently as the starting-point and basis of the national development, that it is impossible to escape the conviction that it was a historical fact, rather than a product of the religious imagination. The prophet indulges in paronomasia in the choice of the two words הלאתיך (= *weary*, v. ^{3}) and העלתיך (*bring up*).—**4c.** *And I sent before thee Moses, Aaron and Miriam*] This is a supplementary note by some reader, as is clear from its prosaic form. This is the only mention of Miriam in the prophetic books. Aaron and Miriam are given a prominence here, as co-leaders with Moses, which they do not have in the earliest sources; *cf.* Ex. $15^{20\ f.}$ 17^{12} $24^{10.\ 14.\ 19}$ Nu. 12^1.

Play on w
Halatyod
Haltyad

Str. IV recites other examples of Yahweh's kindness to Israel, this time taken from the period of wanderings in the desert, in order to convince Israel of her total failure to appreciate Yahweh. **5.** *My people, what did Balak counsel? And what did Balaam answer him?*] An allusion to the events recorded in Nu. 22–24. Familiarity with this story is presupposed by the prophet. By a stroke of the pen the writer brings vividly to mind one of the most striking episodes in Israel's history. On this occasion Yahweh turned a would-be curse into a blessing. The prophet seems to

Ingratitude

recognise at its full face value the supposed destructive effect of a curse. It was only Yahweh's interposition that saved Israel from destruction. This magical, superstitious conception of religion is sadly out of harmony with the magnificent ideal set forth in the immediately following verses.—*Remember, now*, "*from Shittim to Gilgal*"] The verb is supplied here from v. ^{5a} where it is superfluous. It is unanimously conceded that something must be supplied here, if the words are to be retained in the text. Their presence is required by the parallelism. Others, retaining "remember now" in its place in 𝔐, would supply such phrases as "thou knowest what happened to thee";* or "and what I did";† or, repeating זכר, "remember what happened to thee";‡ or "remember the favours I showed thee";§ or "and thy crossing over."** A similar idea to that of our text is found in Dt. 8^2. Shittim was the last camping station before the crossing of the Jordan (Jos. 3^1 = E), while Gilgal was the first encampment after the crossing (Jos. 4^{20} = E). The mention of these two names, therefore, would at once bring to mind the wonderful exhibition of Yahweh's goodness and power in connection with Israel's entrance into the "promised land."—*That thou mayest know the righteous deeds of Yahweh*] These words are dependent upon the preceding admonition to "remember," and they summarise what the incidents from history were intended to teach. If Israel could but realise and appreciate the extent of her obligation to Yahweh, she would surely gladly do his will. The "righteous deeds" are acts of Yahweh which reveal his just and righteous character to the world at large; *cf.* Ju. 5^{11} 1 S. $12^{7\,\mathrm{ff.}}$. They are practically Israel's God-given victories over her foes, which vindicate Yahweh as the strength and stay of his own righteous people. This is the prevailing sense of the word "righteousness" in Is. 40–66.

The case rests here. The prophet has pointed out the obligation resting upon Israel, which grows out of Yahweh's goodness to her. Only by implication is it conveyed that this obligation is unfulfilled. The positive, direct charge against Israel, together with the pronouncement of sentence, remains unuttered. The passage, thus, seems to be only a fragment of a longer address.

srael's
bligations to
od rest on
His Goodness
to her

---

* Cal.. † Mau., Taylor. ‡ Mich., Baur, Kl., Ro.. § Ros.. ** Stei..

1. ריב את] *Cf.* Ho. 12^{5}, where אל in 𝔐 is an error for את, as appears from 12^{4} and 𝔊. To suppose such an error here is better than to render את *in fellowship with* (Ke.) which is impossible, or to treat it as = ל (Mau., Hd., Ro.), or as = את־פני, *in presence of*, *apud* (BDB., 86a; Elh.).—**2.** והאתנים] 𝔐 presents difficulties: (1) the parallel word הרים lacks the article; (2) if an adj., אתנ' should *follow* its noun; (3) as a substantive, it is usually used of perennial streams; (4) the awkwardness of the phrase.—**3.** מֶה] Ges.$^{\S 37\,d}$.—ומה] Adverbial, Kö.$^{\S 332\,c}$.—הלאתיך] On vocalisation, Ges.$^{\S 53\,p.\ 75\,ee}$.—**4a, b.** Clauses are in chiasm.—**5.** השטים] The exact location is unknown; the acacia grove near *Khirbet el-Kefrein* may be a survival of the place.—הגלגל] Probably represented by the northern *Tell Jeljûl*, between the Jordan and Jericho, to the SE. of the latter.

§ 17. *The Character of True Religion* (6^{6-8}).

A discussion of the nature of Yahweh's requirements which yields the finest summary of the content of practical religion to be found in the OT. The material readily resolves itself into three four-line strs. in trimeter movement; the opening of **Str. II** is marked by the introduction of a new subject, while the beginning of **Str. III** is indicated by the change from question to answer. **Str. I** represents an individual inquiring what type of service Yahweh desires. Will gifts satisfy him? **Str. II** continues the inquiry in such a way as to show that even the most elaborate and costly gifts cannot secure Yahweh's favour. **Str. III** answers the inquiry with a positive definition of "pure religion and undefiled." James 1:

NOTE

WHEREWITH shall I come before Yahweh,
And bow myself before the God of heaven?
Shall I come before him with burnt-offerings,
With calves a year old?
WILL Yahweh be pleased with thousands of rams,
With tens of thousands of rivers of oil?
Shall I give my first-born for my transgression,
The fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?
IT has been told thee, O man, what is good.
Yea, what does Yahweh seek from thee,
But to do justice and to love kindness,
And to walk humbly with thy God?

This piece is well preserved; no textual changes, transpositions or omissions are required by the poetic form. The metre is smooth and regular all through, except in ^{7a} and ^{8c} in each of which an extra tone appears. Siev. omits a word in each of these two long lines, but this is arbitrary.

Since Ew.'s time this section has generally been assigned to the days of Manasseh, either as a product of Micah's old age, or as the work of a writer of the Deuteronomic School. The great reason for this has been the allusion to human sacrifice which is supposed to reflect the evil days when the king set the example by offering up his own son (2 K. 21^6). But We. rightly calls attention to the fact that human sacrifice in our passage is not cited as a common practice, but rather as a sample of extraordinary sacrificial zeal. Such sporadic cases of religion grown desperate occur long before the reign of Manasseh. Hence we must rely upon other evidence for the date of these verses. The tone and spirit of the passage are wholly different from those of chs. 1–3. The calm, dispassionate speech of the teacher displaces the forceful utterance of the prophet. The same conception of religion appears as in Am. 5^{26} Je. $7^{22 \text{ f.}}$ Ho. 6^6 Is. 1^{11-17} Ps. 40^{6-8} 50^{8-14} $51^{16 \text{ f.}}$; and this was never without its representatives in Israel from the age of Amos to the end. It is wholly unwarrantable to bring the poem down to 100 B.C. as Hpt. does, on the ground of its supposed reflection of the teachings of the Essenes. The fact that the answer is addressed to an individual, and to *any* individual of the great human race, seems to point to the age when national lines were broken over and the scope and appeal of the true religion was recognised as universal. In this respect the passage is in harmony with such writings as Jonah, Ruth, and large sections of the Wisdom literature. On the whole, therefore, a date early in the postexilic period seems the most probable.

6. אכף] 𝔊 *ἀντιλήψομαι*, treating it as a denominative from כַּף. Gr. אָנִיף. Elh. אֲכַפֵּר א'.—**7.** נחלי] 𝔊 *χιμάρων* (so 𝔖); perhaps to be corrected to *χειμάῤῥων*, as in 𝔊$^{\text{BQ. 147. 233}}$ and Aq.; but *cf.* Ry.. 𝔊$^{\text{A}}$ *ἀρνῶν*. 𝔙 *hircorum*. 𝔖 *strength*, connecting with חַיִל.—שמן] 𝔖 *heifers*, probably a free rendering "strength of fat ones," *i. e.* "*heifers*"; the latter word is a formation from the root משח "to anoint with oil, etc.."—הַאתן וגו'] 𝔖 *I will not offer my first-born* (*a sin is he to me*); *nor the fruits of my body* (*a sin of my soul are they to me*).—בכורי] 𝔊 = בכורַי.—**8.** הגיד] 𝔊 *εἰ ἀνηγγέλη*; hence We. הֻגַּד; so Now., Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, Marti, Siev., Gu., Du.. 𝔙 *Indicabo;* so 𝔖. Aq., Θ *ἐρρέθη*.—אדם] Che.$^{\text{CB}}$, אלהים.—והצנע] 𝔊 *καὶ ἕτοιμον εἶναι*; so 𝔖. Gr. והכנע. Che.$^{\text{CB}}$, וְכַלּוֹת מְנַעֲצֵי א'.

Str. I introduces an inquirer asking a series of rhetorical questions, evidently presupposing a negative answer. The prophet by the very form of these questions desires to suggest the absurdity of the popular conception of Yahweh and of his desires.—**6.** *Wherewith shall I come before Yahweh, and bow myself before the*

God of heaven] A question growing out of the conception of Yahweh as a great and mighty king to whom his subjects must bring presents when they would approach his presence; *cf.* 1 S. $6^{2\text{ ff.}}$ $10^{3\text{ f.}}$ 25^{27} 2 S. $16^{1\text{ f.}}$. It is inculcated by the law; Ex. 23^{15} 34^{20}. It is an essentially commercial view of the relation between Yahweh and his worshippers, and its prevalence was consonant with an almost total lack of conscience in the sphere of morals and social justice; *cf.* Is. $1^{15.\ 23}$ $28^{7.\ 8}$ Am. 4^1 $5^{7.\ 10-12}$ Ho. 6^{6-10} Je. $5^{1\text{ ff.}}$ 9^{1-6}. It operated exactly like the sale of indulgences under the popes of the Middle Ages. The whole prophetic teaching concerning sacrifices and offerings was an endeavour to show that such gifts and ceremonies were of themselves without value in the sight of God. The term "God of the height," *i. e.* the heavens, is used in contrast to the verb "bow" to emphasise the humility and dependence of the worshipper. It is in harmony also with the priestly thought of God as ineffably holy and transcendent, far removed from the sins of men; *cf.* Ho. 5^{15} Is. 18^4 Mi. $1^{2\text{ f.}}$ Je. 25^{30}. The title may have grown up in response to the effort to exalt Yahweh above the host of foreign gods clamouring for admission into Israel.*—*Shall I come before him with burnt-offerings, with calves a year old?*] The fact that the burnt-offering is mentioned rather than the sin-offering is no satisfactory proof of the pre-exilic origin of this passage; first, because it is improbable that the sin-offering first came into existence and prominence in the exilic period, even if the literature first recognises it at that time. The ritual of the Holiness Code, Ezekiel and the Priestly Code was not the creation of those writings but was an inheritance in large part, which it was the task of exilic and postexilic law-makers to codify and inform with new meaning, in so far as it failed to express the best religious thought of the age. Second, because the thought of the prophet here is not concerned with any particular offering as such, but rather with the whole sacrificial system, the efficacy of which in and of itself he wishes to deny. Calves were eligible for sacrifice from the age of seven days on (Lv. 22^{27}); *cf.* Ex. 22^{30}. A yearling was, of course, relatively valuable; *cf.* Lv. 9^3 Gn. 15^9.

Str. II continues the rhetorical question, the possible gifts to

---

* *Cf.* Westphal, *Jahwes Wohnstätten* (1908), 265.

Yahweh becoming more costly with each succeeding question.—**7.** *Will Yahweh be pleased with thousands of rams, with tens of thousands of streams of oil?*] In neither this nor the preceding interrogation does the negative answer involved imply that the prophet thought of Yahweh as displeased with sacrifice *per se; cf.* H.^{AH}, 136 *f.*. He would merely repudiate the thought that sacrifice is *all* that Yahweh desires. For sacrifices on a large scale, *cf.* 1 K. 3^4 8^{63}. Oil was an acceptable gift to deity among Egyptians and Babylonians as well as Hebrews; *cf.* Gn. 28^{18} 35^{14} Ex. $29^{2.\,40}$ Lv. $2^{1.\,4}$ 7^{12} $14^{10\,\mathrm{ff.}}$. There is no mention of oil in connection with the sin-offering (Lv. $5^{1\,\mathrm{ff.}}$).*—*Shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul*] Human sacrifice existed in Israel from the earliest times down to a relatively late date; witness, the law of the redemption of the first-born (Ex. 13^{13}); the story of the contemplated sacrifice of Isaac (Gn. 22^{13}); the fulfilment of Jephthah's vow (Ju. $11^{34\,\mathrm{ff.}}$); the sacrifice of the sons of Ahaz (2K. 16^3) and Manasseh (2 K. $21^{2\,\mathrm{ff.}}$); the denunciations by the prophets (Je. 7^{31} 19^5 Ez. 16^{20} 20^{26} Is. 57^5); and the prohibition in the law (Lv. 18^{21} 20^2); *cf.* also the act of Mesha, king of Moab, and its apparent effect upon the Israelitish army (2 K. 3^{27}). The practice was not equally prevalent at all times, but seems to have attained its greatest prominence in the days of Manasseh. Our passage evidently conceives of it as a possible method of pleasing Yahweh, putting it upon the same plane as burnt-offerings and libations of oil. A mere formal, external, mechanical conception of religion does not give rise to nor sustain the custom of human sacrifice. It is the acme of religious zeal. It is the expression of the religious emotions of men who agonise with longing for the divine blessing, and are willing to yield their hearts' dearest treasures in order to secure it. The prophet here recognises this fact, and his words, therefore, reflect an unmistakable depth of sympathy and tenderness toward his people. But the practice grows out of a wholly wrong idea of the character of God, and therefore can never be pleasing to him. The phrase *sin of my soul* has been taken by many as *sin-offering of my soul;* but this cannot well be, for the parallel word *transgression* never has the meaning *guilt-*

Human
Sacrifice

---

* On the place of oil in early ritual and its primitive significance, *cf.* Now. *Arch.* II, 208 *f.*.

offering, and the technical sin-offering of the later law certainly never contemplated the possibility of human sacrifice as one of its constituent elements. The term *soul* here designates the psychic self, the seat of the desires and the will, and is used in deliberate contrast to the term *fruit of my body*.

In **Str. III** the oracle rises to its climax, with the beautifully simple statement of the essence of religion.—**8.** *It has been told thee, O man, what is good*] The preceding questions have been raised only to be answered in the negative; the positive statement is now to be made. The address is to mankind in general, not to any particular individual. The "good" referred to is accessible to the whole race, without restriction. The verb might also be rendered, "He (*i. e.* Yahweh) has told thee"; but in view of the absence of any near antecedent for the pronoun and of the fact that a new str. begins with this phrase, which should therefore be complete in itself, the indefinite form of expression seems preferable.—*And what does Yahweh seek from thee*] The "good" is identified with the performance of the will of Yahweh. This is the view of the OT. throughout. Religion furnished the dynamic of ethics. The saints of Israel knew nothing of doing good for good's sake; virtue was not an end in itself, but only a way of approach to God, the embodiment of the highest good.—*But to do justice and to love kindness and to walk humbly with thy God?*] Nothing new is said here. Amos had emphasised Yahweh's insistence upon justice (*e. g.* 5^{24}; *cf.* Dt. 16^{18-20}); Hosea had exhibited the virtues of love (*e. g.* 6^{6}) and the whole book of Deuteronomy is permeated by the thought of it (*e. g.* 10^{12-22} 14^{29} $15^{9\text{ ff.}}$ 22^{1-4}); reverence and humility before God was no new ideal—Moses was credited with it in a surpassing degree (Nu. 12^{3}); *cf.* Am. 2^{7} Zp. 2^{3} Is. 6 29^{19}. But it is, nevertheless, a great saying surpassed by nothing in the OT. and by but little in the New. It lays hold of the essential elements in religion and, detaching them from all else, sets them in clear relief. It links ethics with piety, duty toward men with duty toward God, and makes them both coequal factors in religion. In this respect it anticipates the famous saying of Jesus (Mt. 22^{34-40}), and it marks a wide breach with the popular religion of the prophet's own times. With the latter, religion was pre-emi-

what is
Good—
God's
Will

nently a matter of obligation toward God, and this obligation was looked upon as consisting mainly in the proper performance of sacred rites and in a liberal bestowal of sacrificial gifts. But this prophet makes religion an inner experience which determines whole sphere of human activity. Religion becomes not merely the action, but also, and chiefly, character.

6. בַּמָּה] On d. f. in מ, Ges.$^{\S\,102\,k}$.—**7.** פשעי] נתן with two acc. having the meaning "give something in exchange for, in compensation for something"; so Ez. 27^{14} (*cf.* 27$^{12.\,13.\,16.\,17.\,19.\,22}$). This is better than to make 'פ an acc. of purpose or effect and to create for it the meaning 'guilt offering' which it nowhere else possesses; *contra* Kö.$^{\S\,327\,t}$.—חטאת] has the meaning 'sin-offering' first in 2 K. 12^{17}, where it denotes a payment of money to the priests. From the time of Ezekiel on, this meaning is very common in the legal literature and in Chronicles. But it is not appropriate here because of (1) the parallel word and (2) the nature of the gift here spoken of.—**8.** הגיד] On the indefinite subj. expressed by 3d pers. sg. masc., Ges.$^{\S\,144\,d}$.—ומה] On change to direct question, Kö.$^{\S\,377\,d}$.—הצנע] An adv. use of inf. abs., denoting here manner; *cf.* Kö.$^{\S\,402\,e.\,399\,n.\,223\,b}$. The meaning of $\sqrt{}$ seems to be "modest"; *cf.* Pr. 11^{2}; it is the reverse of 'arrogant,' 'conceited,' 'self-sufficient.' Its idea suggests the parable of Lk. 18$^{10\,ff.}$

§ 18. *The Sin of the City and the Punishment to Come* (6$^{9-16}$).

This section gives a vivid poetical description of Israel's wicked life and of the disasters which Yahweh must bring upon the nation as punishment. Yahweh himself is represented as speaking, and his utterance falls into five four-line strs. of prevailingly trimeter movement. **Str. I** addresses the city in Yahweh's name and characterises it as an abode of violence and deceit. **Str. II** asserts that the riches of the town have been acquired by cheating and fraud in ordinary commercial transactions. **Str. III** announces that Yahweh's hand will soon begin the task of chastisement and that all attempts at escape will be futile. **Str. IV** details the various forms which the chastisement will assume, all of them involving famine. **Str. V** states that all this terrible wickedness is due to persistence in the sins of the past and that the inevitable result is destruction. The first two strs., thus, denounce the city's sins, the second two announce the consequent doom, while the last str. summarises both sin and punishment.

HARK! Yahweh is calling to the city:
Hear, O tribe and assembly of the city,
Whose rich men are full of violence,
And her inhabitants speak falsehood.
CAN I forget the treasures in the house of the wicked,
And the accursed scant measure?
Can I treat as pure him with the wicked balances,
And with the bag of false weights?
BUT I, now, will begin to smite thee,
To lay thee in ruins on account of thy sins and thy . . . in the midst of thee.
And thou shalt try to remove but shalt not rescue,
And what thou rescuest I will bring to the sword.
THOU shalt eat, but not be satisfied;
Thou shalt sow, but not reap;
Thou shalt tread out the olive, but not anoint thyself with oil;
And the must, but thou shalt not drink wine.
FOR thou hast kept the statutes of Omri,
And all the activity of the house of Ahab;
In order that I may give thee to ruin,
And her inhabitants to mockery.

This piece has undergone much change in its transmission. The arrangement here given involves the omission of vv. $^{9b.\ 12c.\ 16e.\ f}$, and the transposition of vv. $^{12a.\ b}$ to follow v. ^{9} and of v. ^{14a} to precede v. ^{15}. The reconstruction is almost identical with that offered by Marti, but the elision of v. ^{9b} and the two transpositions were decided upon before the appearance of Marti's commentary. Siev. (followed closely by Gu.) retains only vv. $^{9a.\ c.\ 10.\ 11.\ 13}$, dropping v. ^{12} as a gloss, and athetizes vv. $^{14a.\ 15}$ as a separate poem, dropping v. $^{14b.\ c.\ d}$ as a gloss, and transposing v. $^{16a.\ b}$ to follow 5^{4}, with v. $^{16c.\ d.\ e}$ as a gloss. The passage as it stands in 𝔐 defies all attempts to trace any logical continuity, but such radical treatment is unnecessary. The movement of thought in the poem as here reconstructed is perfectly natural and simple; and metrical considerations of themselves, unsupported by other evidences, do not warrant extreme measures in textual criticism.

This section is wholly independent of the preceding one. There the tone is one of sympathy and instruction; here it is denunciation of sin. The date and origin of this prophecy are problems that have not been solved. Stk., van H. and Du. assign it to Micah; Marti places it in the postexilic period, urging the linguistic usage and the historical reminiscence in v. ^{16} as evidences of late date; while We., Now. and GASm. are undecided as to its time. The fact is that the utterance might belong to any period of Israelitish history subsequent to the reign of Ahab. Parallels to it may be found all through the history of prophecy. The sins specifically mentioned are characteristically urban and would argue equally well for the authorship of Micah who was indignant against the oppression and vice of the great city, or for the last days when Jerusalem was the centre of all Jewish interests and trade and commerce had come to occupy a large place in Jewish life. The prophecy would seem most fitting at a time when some disaster to the city was imminent, or was thought to be so; but such periods were only too frequent both before and after the exile. Tradition claims the passage for Micah and cannot be proved wrong; but, on the other hand, the surrounding context, which is certainly not due to Micah, is likewise claimed for him by tradition; hence, the question must remain open.

9. יקרא] 𝔊 *ἐπικληθήσεται.*—ותושיה] 𝔊 *καὶ σώσει* = והושיע. Hal. אַתְּ אֲשֶׁר יָהּ.—יִרְאֶה] Rd. יִרְאָה, with Ew., Hi., Pont, Gr., Or., Now., GASm., Oort^{Em}., Marti, van H., Gu., Du.; *cf.* 𝔊 *φοβουμένους*; so 𝔙 𝔖. Four codd. of Kenn. and 3 of de R. יראי; so Theiner, Rosenm., Gu.. Taylor, לְיִרְאֵי. We. יִרְאַת.—שמך] 𝔊 𝔖 𝔗 = שְׁמוֹ; so Ro., Taylor, Pont, We., Gr., Gu., Oort^{Em}., Now..—שמעו] 𝔊 𝔖 𝔗 sg.; so Du.. Ro., Gu. שָׁמֵעַ.—מטה] 𝔊 𝔖 𝔙, vocative. Ro. מַטֵּהוּ.—ומי יעדה עוד]. Rd., with We., וּמוֹעֵד הָעִיר; so Perles, GASm., Now., Marti, van H., Du., Hpt.. 𝔊 *καὶ τίς κοσμήσει πόλιν* = וּמִי יַעְדֶּה עִיר. 𝔙 *et quis approbabit illud?* 𝔖 *and who bears witness?* = וּמִי יְעִידֶהָ. 𝔗 *and the rest of the people of the land* = וּמוֹעֲדָהּ. Ro. מִי יָעִיר הָעִיר. Gr. ומי יעדה לעיר. Hal. רְמִיָּה וְזָדוֹן. Oort^{Em}. om. עוד ה׳ as dittog. from יעדה. Siev. and Gu. מַטֵּה הָעִיר וּמוֹעֲדָהּ. Elh. וּמַטֵּהוּ בּוֹ יָעַד הָעִיר.—**10.** האש] Rd., with We., הַאֶשֶּׁה, impf. of נשה; so Now., Marti, Siev., van H., Hpt., Gu.. 𝔊 *μὴ πῦρ* = הַאֵשׁ; so 𝔖 𝔙, but with הָ. Schnurrer, connecting with foll. word, הַאַשְׁבִּית; so Oort^{Em}.. Du. הַאֶשָּׂא.—בית] One cod. each of Kenn. and de R. בבית; *cf.* 𝔖 𝔙. Du. בַּת. Elh. יַצִּית.—רָשָׁע] Oort^{Em}. om. as dittog.. Du. om. with בת as a variant of אצ׳ ר׳. Elh. עֹשֶׁר.—אצרות] Rd. אֹצָרוֹת, with Marti, Now.^{K}, Siev., Gu.. 𝔊 inserts *θησαυρίζων* = אֹצֶרֶת.—רֶשַׁע] Om. as dittog. with Marti, Now.^{K}, Siev., Gu..—ואיפת רזון זעומה] 𝔊 *καὶ μετὰ* (probably an error for *μέτρα*; so Ro.; *cf.* Am. 8^{5}) *ὕβρεως ἀδικία*; *cf.* 𝔙 *et mensura minor irae plena.* Elh. ואיבת זָדוֹן זעם יהוה. Gr. רֹזֶן. Oort^{Em}. אזעם.—**11.** האזכה] Rd., with We. הַאֲזַכֵּהוּ; so Now., Marti, Siev., van H., Gu.. 𝔊 *εἰ δικαιωθήσεται.* = הֲיִזְכֶּה; so Ew., Che., Gr., Gu.. 𝔖 𝔗 similarly, but in pl.. 𝔙 *numquid justificabo.* Ro. הַאֲזַכֶּה; so Elh., Pont, Hal., Du.. GASm. הֲתִזְכֶּה. Oort^{Em}. הַאֲזַכֶּה. Hpt. הַאַזְכֶּה.—במאזני רשע] 𝔊 *ἐν ζυγῷ ἄνομος* = במאזנים רָשָׁע.—**12.** עשיריה] 𝔊 *τὸν πλοῦτον αὐτῶν* = עָשְׁרָם.—רמיה] 𝔊^{B} *ὑψώθητι*; 𝔊^{AQ} *ὑψώθη.*—**13.** הֶחֱלֵיתִי] Rd. הַחִלּוֹתִי, with 𝔊 *ἄρξομαι*; so 𝔙 𝔖 Aq., Bauer, Struensee, Ro., Elh., We., Pont, Gu., GASm., SS., Oort^{Em}., Now., Marti, Siev., Du.. *Cf.* 11 codd (Kenn.) החלתי; Θ *καὶ ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς ἐγώ εἰμι ὃς ἐκάλεσα.* Σ *ἐτιμωρησάμην.*—השמם] 𝔊 *ἀφανιῶ σε*; so 𝔖. 𝔙 *perditione*; so Aq., Σ . Θ *ἐξέστησαν.*—**14.** וישחך] 𝔊 Θ *σκοτάσει* = וְיֶחְשַׁךְ. 𝔊^{Q}, several mss. and 𝔖^{H} *καὶ ἐξώσω σε.* Aq., *καὶ καταφυτεύσω* σε = ואשהלך. Σ ἀλλὰ καὶ διαφθερεῖ σε = וישחתך. 𝔙 *humiliatio tua.* 𝔖 *dysentery.* Che. כהשך (*cf.* Ps. 109^{24}). Elh. וְיַשְׁחֲךָ. Gr. וִיכַחֶשְׁךָ. Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$ וְחֵשֶׁק. Marti, אֲשֶׁר. Marg. ואשחך בקרבה. Hpt. וְיֵשׁ חֵן. Du. וַיַּשְׂאֵךְ.—ותסג] 𝔊 *καὶ ἐκνεύσει* = ותסוג. 𝔙 *apprehendes* = וְתַסִּיג = וְתַשִּׂיג; so 𝔖 𝔗 Aq., Σ. Six codd. ותשג. Gr., Du. תַּשֵּׂג. Marti, תַּסִּיג. Hpt. וְיִסֹּג. —תְּפַלֵּט] Ro. תפליט; so Ry., Elh..—**15.** תשחה יין] 𝔊 om. noun and has vb. in pl., perhaps reading תִּשְׁתָּיוּן; so Ro., Ry., Taylor. 𝔖 also om. יין, but retains vb. in sg..—**16.** וישתמר] Rd. וַתִּשְׁמֹר, with Ro., We., Gu., Or., GASm., Now., Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, Marti, Siev., van H., Du., Hpt.; foll. 𝔊 𝔖 𝔗 𝔙 Θ. 𝔙 *custodisti;* so 𝔖 𝔗 Θ. 𝔊 has a double rendering of the phrase, viz. *καὶ ἀφανισθήσεται νόμιμα λαοῦ μου καὶ ἐφύλαξας τὰ δικαιώματα Ζαμβρεί.* One cod. of Kenn. וישמר. Taylor, וְיִשָּׁמְרוּ. Elh. וַיִּשָּׁמֵר. Gr., Marg. וַתִּשְׁמְרוּ.—מעשה] 𝔊 𝔖 𝔗 Aq., pl..—ותלכו] We., Or. and Gu. sg..—אתך] 𝔖 = אִתָּה; so Now.. Hal. אתכם.—ישביה] Hartmann, יֹשְׁבֵיךְ; so Pont, Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, Du..—חרפת] 𝔊 𝔗 pl..—עמי] Rd. עַמִּים, with 𝔊 λαῶν; so Schnurrer, Struensee, Hartmann, Bauer, Ro., Che., Taylor, Elh., Pont, We., Gr., Gu., Or., GASm., Now., Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, Marti, Hal., Siev., Du., Hpt..

In **Str. I** the prophet introduces Yahweh who addresses the city, declaring it to be full of oppression and trickery.—**9.** *Hark! Yahweh is calling to the city*] Jerusalem is certainly meant, as the city *par excellence* for all Jews.*—*And it is success to fear thy name*] A gloss† as is clear from its parenthetical character and the use of the word "success" which is characteristic of the wisdom literature, though found also in Is. 28^{29}. 𝔐 can only be translated, "and he who sees thy name is strong"; and this unique expression has given rise to a wide variety of explanations, none of which are satisfactory. With the thought of the text as corrected, *cf.* Pr. 1^{7} 9^{10} 14^{27} Ps. 34^{11} 111^{10}.—*Hear, O tribe, and the assembly of the city*] Judah is the tribe addressed, and the assembly is the general meeting of the citizens of Jerusalem for the consideration of all matters affecting the welfare of the city as a whole. It probably corresponds roughly to the "town-meeting" of New England. The presupposition of the prophet that in addressing the population of Jerusalem he speaks practically to the tribe of Judah seems to reflect a period when Jerusalem had come to be the centre of Jewish interest and life. 𝔐 is to be translated "hear the rod and the one who appointed it," "the rod" being a concrete designation of the chastisement to be inflicted by Yahweh; but this involves using "hear" in the double sense "hear about" and "listen to," it makes the feminine suffix refer to a masculine antecedent, and it treats the indefinite noun "rod" as definite. Hence the text as corrected, in accordance with 𝔊 and 𝔗, is preferred by many recent scholars.—**12.** *Whose rich men are full of violence*] The transfer of v. ^{12} to this position furnishes the feminine suffixes of v. ^{12} the required antecedent, which is lacking when it follows v. ^{11}; and also yields the two lines necessary to complete **Str. I**, leaving v. ^{10} to go with v. ^{11} into **Str. II** where they belong together. The charge against Jerusalem's rich is that they have gained their wealth by oppression and injustice, a not infrequent complaint of the prophets; *cf.* Am. 3^{10} 6^{3} Zp. 1^{9} Ez. 7^{23} 8^{17} Is. 59^{6}.—*And her inhabitants speak falsehood*] While violence was predicated only of the rich, deceit is charged against all without discrimination. This is practically saying that all are equally bad; the poor would be as oppressive as the rich had they but the power. Trickery which is possible for all is confined to no especial class.—*And their tongue is deceit in their mouths*] A vivid way of saying that not a word they speak can be trusted. Lying is a common oriental vice even at the present day, and apparently always has been; *cf.* Ho. 7^{1} 10^{4} Je. 6^{13} 9^{3-5} Zc. 5^{4} Lv. 19^{11}. This phrase is to be set aside as a gloss on the preceding line;* *cf.* Ps. $120^{2.\,3}$. It adds nothing and is superfluous to the str. and the parallelism.

---

* *Cf.* The use of *urbs* = Rome, cited by Marti.

† So Hartmann (1800), Grimm (*JAOS.* XXII, 36), GASm., Marti, Siev., Gu., Du., Hpt..

Str. II points out the impossibility of Yahweh's condoning or justifying a certain kind of cheating commonly practised in the commercial transactions of his day.—**10.** *Can I forget the treasures in the house of the wicked*] These ill-gotten gains must always arise as an ugly reminder of the injustice through which they were obtained and so render it impossible for Yahweh to be gracious. 𝔐 is corrupt here and obscure. It has been variously rendered; *e. g.* "Are there yet treasures, etc.,"† with the variations "are there not yet?" and "there are yet"; but this is improbable grammatically (*v. i.*). Or, "the great man is yet in the palace, etc.";* or "fire devours the houses, etc.," *cf.* 𝔊.† Or, yet again, "are there yet foundations in the house, etc."‡ For the corrected text, *v. s.*.—*And the accursed scant measure?*] In days when no fixed and unvarying standard for weights and measures was known and when no police power existed for the enforcement of such laws, knavery of this type was doubtless very common; *cf.* Am. 8^5 Dt. 25^{14}. But Yahweh's curse is upon all such dealings (Dt. 25^{16}); he demands justice and fair dealing between one man and another. **11.** *Can I treat as pure him with the wicked balances, and with the bag of false weights?*] *Cf.* Dt. 25^{13} Ps. 18^{26}. This closes Yahweh's appeal to the moral consciousness of Israel. He has pointed out the moral impossibility of his permitting wickedness to go unpunished. According to 𝔐 the verb must be rendered, "can I be pure with, etc." This has usually been interpreted either as representing Yahweh asking how he could be considered pure and holy, if he permitted such unfair practices; or as dependent upon an unexpressed thought such as "let each one ask himself." But neither interpretation makes good Hebrew usage.

---

* So Marti, Now.^{K}, Du..

† So Cal., Dathe, Rosenm., Hi., Mau., Ew., Um., Kl., Or., Hd., Casp., Ke., *et al.*.

Str. III begins the description of the punishment involved by the sins just exposed. A hostile army will invade Israel.—**13.** *But I, indeed, will begin to smite thee*] For a similar idiom, *cf.* Dt. 2^{31}. The pronoun refers, not to the individual guilty of the offences just described, but to the "tribe" (v. ^{9}) as a whole. 𝔐 reads, "but I, indeed, will make sore thy smiting"; *cf.* Na. 3^{19} Je. 30^{12}. But this use of the verb "make sick" is not paralleled elsewhere, hence the change of pointing suggested by 𝔊 seems preferable.—*To lay thee in ruins on account of thy sins*] The pronominal object is not expressed in the Hebrew text, but is clearly implied in the context.—**14b, c, d.** *And thy . . . in the midst of thee*] The meaning of the main word in this phrase is wholly unknown; no help is to be derived from the Vrss.. In its present context, parallel as it is with "thy sins," some such meaning as "transgressions" or "abominations" seems called for. In its context as in 𝔐, the meaning "hunger" or "emptiness" is usually conjectured for the noun; but the presence of the suffix is hardly in harmony with such a rendering. The cognate languages know no such word. Hence no assurance is possible as to its meaning. —*And thou shalt try to remove but shalt not deliver; and what thou dost deliver, I will give to the sword*] The first part of the statement apparently refers to property, none of which will be saved; the second, to the women and children who, though temporarily carried to a place of refuge, will finally meet death at the hands of the enemy. Margolis, following Ibn Ǧanaḥ, adopts the rendering, "and she shall conceive, but shall not bear; and whomsoever she beareth I will give to the sword." On the basis of this Margolis suggests for the preceding phrase, "and thy wife in her body" (*v. s.*). But against this must be urged the harshness of the idiom, "thy wife shall conceive in her body"; and the fact that תסג nowhere else in the OT. approximates the meaning 'conceive'; the regular verb for this idea is הרה.

---

* So AE., Ra., Abar., Struensee.

† So Mich..

‡ So Ro..

Str. IV continues the description of the coming disaster, by pointing out with a few bold strokes how all of Israel's labour shall count for naught.—**14a.** *Thou shalt eat, but not be satisfied*] The thought of an invading enemy is still in the prophet's mind. Pent up in the city by siege and reduced gradually to the last extremities, Israel will know all the agonies of starvation; *cf.* 2 K. 6[25] Je. 52[6] Lv. 26[25 f.]. The transference of this line to this place in **Str. IV** is made imperative by the break which it causes in the connection between v. [13] and v. [14b], by the admirable connection thereby established between v. [14a] and v. [15], and by the ease with which it solves the problem of the strophic structure.—**15.** *Thou shalt sow, but not reap*] The process of harvest will be prevented by the advance of the enemy; *cf.* Dt. 28[38 ff.].—*Thou shalt tread out the olive, but not anoint thyself with oil*] This is the only direct mention of the treading out of olive-oil; *cf.* Jo. 2[24]. The finest oil was "beaten" (Ex. 27[20] Lv. 24[2]); but the bulk of the olive crop was trodden out into oil vats. Anointing with oil was a toilet custom common to all hot climates; *cf.* Am. 6[6] 2 S. 12[20] 14[2] Ru. 3[3] 2 Ch. 28[15].—*And the must, but thou shalt not drink wine*] All the joy of life will be cut off. Allusions to the treading out of wine are very common; *cf.* Ju. 9[27] Am. 9[13] Is. 16[10] 63[2] Je. 25[30] Jb. 24[11] Ne. 13[15].

Str. V closes the poem summarising the sin of Israel and declaring it to be the occasion of the disaster which Yahweh will send.—

16. *For thou hast kept the statutes of Omri*] No special "statutes of Omri" are elsewhere mentioned, and it is doubtful whether this expression is meant to apply to definite laws. Omri is harshly condemned by the Deuteronomist in 1 K. $16^{25\text{ f.}}$. But he is probably mentioned here as the founder of the strongest dynasty of northern Israel, and thus as representative of the type of life characteristic of that kingdom and responsible for its downfall in 721 B.C. In Assyrian records after the reign of Omri, the northern kingdom was commonly designated *bît Ḫumri.—And all the work of the house of Ahab*] In view of the charges made in vv. $^{10-12}$, it is probable that reference is had here to the judicial murder of Naboth (1 K. 21), as typical of the methods of self-aggrandisement common to Ahab and the tyrannical rich men of Jerusalem. —*And ye walk in their counsels*] This adds nothing to the thought, is extraneous to the metrical form, and uses the plural of the verb, whereas the preceding and following context has the singular. Hence it is best considered as a gloss.* For similar phraseology, *cf.* 2 K. 16^{3} Je. 7^{24} Ps. 1^{1} 81^{12} 1 S. 8^{3}.—*In order that I may give thee to ruin*] In accordance with a common Hebrew usage, the prophet ironically attributes what was an inevitable but undesigned consequence of a course of action to the deliberate purpose of the actor.—*And her inhabitants to mockery*] The pronoun must refer to the city, as in v. ^{12b}; the sudden change of person is abrupt and confusing, but finds many parallels in Hebrew; *cf.* Gn. 49^{4} 1 K. 1^{20} Is. 22^{16} 23^{3} 31^{6}. That there may be no possible doubt as to the source of the mockery, a reader has added the gloss,† *and the scorn of the peoples ye shall bear*] The evidence for the secondary character of this line is identical with that for the later origin of the addition to v. ^{16b}. This threat represents the lowest depths of humiliation to the proud and sensitive Hebrew spirit. 𝔐's "scorn of my people" has occasioned great fertility of exegetical ingenuity, *e. g.* Israel will not be punished as heathen are but far more severely in proportion to their privileges,‡ or the suffering brought upon the people of God by their rich oppressors will now be inflicted upon the rich themselves by the foreign foe;§

---

* So Marti, Now.^{K}, Siev., Du..

† So now Du.; but *v. AJSL.* XXIV, 187 *ff.*, where this suggestion was first published.

‡ Cal..

§ Dathe, Rosenm..

or, the heathen will delight in humiliating the nation representing the ideal of "the people of God," but this disgrace will justly be endured by the present representatives of the ideal who are responsible for its being brought into disrepute;* or, the disgrace which my people has brought upon my name will be borne by you;† or, Israel must bear the disgrace of being the people whom I have rejected;‡ or, the chastisement borne by the people as a whole will also be borne by each one of you individually.§ But none of them are satisfactory solutions of the difficulty occasioned by the essential identity of the subject of the verb and the phrase "my people."

9. תושיה] On meaning and etymology, *cf.* Grimm, *JAOS.* XXII, 35–44, who rightly connects it with Assy. *asû*, "to support, to help," as a *tuqtilat* form.—יראה] Kö.$^{\S\,306\,q}$ explains 𝔐 as due to the Massoretes having supposed an ellipsis of איש; *cf.* Kö.$^{\S\,226\,c}$, where all infs. in ה ָ are cited.—מטה] Of masc. gender acc. to Ex. 4^{17}; the fact that the pl. ending is ות ֹ (Nu. 17^{22}) is, of course, no indication of fem. gender; *cf.* מארות, אבות.—מי] Usually rendered *him who*, but this would require אשר; מי always has interrog. force, direct or indirect. For the meaning *assembly* given to the emendation מועד, *cf.* Jb. 30^{23} Nu. 16^2 Is. 14^{13} Lam. 1^{15}.—**10.** עוד האש] ע׳ precedes interrogative only in Gn. 19^{12}, but there interrogative is a pronoun which often yields first place in the sentence to some more important word. If אִשׁ = יֵשׁ, *cf.* Ges.$^{\S\,47\,b}$ on interchange of א and י, and the regular usage in Aram.. 2 S. 14^{19} is, perhaps, another example of the confusion of these two words, but the text there is by no means certain; *cf.* also Pr. 18^{24}.—בית רשע] = בְּבית ר׳; *cf.* דֶּרֶךְ, Ho. 6^9; an acc. of place in which, Ges.$^{\S\,118\,g}$.—אזכה] The Pi'el does not elsewhere have the forensic force of "declare pure" or "treat as pure"; but since it occurs only three times, and since the Qal does carry the forensic idea (Ps. 51^6), this can hardly be considered a serious objection to the reading proposed.—אבני] Weights were commonly of stone, as may be seen by an examination of the fine collection in the Haskell Museum.—מרמה] Very common in the Psalms, and Wisdom Literature; but also in early books, *cf.* Am. 8^5 Ho. 12^8 Je. 5^{27}.—**13.** השמם] In 𝔐 both this and הכות are substs. and in relation of obj. to החליתי; but in corrected text, they are supplementary infins. with verb. force.—**14.** ישחך] 𝔗 derives from √ שחח, as a noun formation with prefix י. Old etymology was to connect it by metathesis with Ar. حَشَّ, *be famished* (so *e. g.* Ges., Hi., Ew.); Hd. proposed شح, = the Syr., *dysentery;* but neither of these meanings combines well with the suffix, and the context as reconstructed demands an entirely different sense.—וְתַסֵּג] On juss. in protasis, *cf.* Dr. §§ $^{152\ 2.3.\ 155\ \mathrm{obs.}}$. Hiph. of סוג elsewhere is always used of the displacement of a boundary; but Hiph. occurs in all only 7 times, and in the Qal, Niph. and Hoph. no such restriction of its scope of activity appears.—תפליט . . . הפלט] Hiph. only here and Is. 5^{29}; used for sake of variety; there is no necessity for correcting the text to produce identity of form; the related vb. מלט likewise shares the meaning "deliver" between Hiph. and Piʿel.—**15.** תסוך] Always of the anointing in the toilet; with the acc. of material here and 2 S. 14^{2} Dt. 28^{40}. משח is used of both secular and religious anointing; *cf.* Am. 6^{6} Je. 22^{14} Lv. 7^{36}.—**16.** וישתמר] Masc. sg. of vb. with two subjects, nearer of which is in fem. pl., Kö. $^{\S 348\,\mathrm{i}.\,349\,\mathrm{a}}$; but this, difficult as it is, is not in keeping with the meaning of the Hithp. in Ps. 18^{24} (= 2 S. 22^{24}); nor can חקות be treated as acc. after the Hithp.. The consecution of vb. forms in 𝔐 of vv. $^{15.\ 16}$ is abnormal, viz. simple impf., impf. with וְ, impf. with וַ. Impf. with וַ is better at beginning of v. ^{16} since reference is to a definite fact of the past and present.—למען] On force of purpose clause, *cf.* Dt. 29^{18} Ho. 8^{4} Am. 2^{7}, and Kö. $^{\S 396\,\mathrm{e}}$.—שרקה] Always in parall. with שמה. *Cf.* Wkl. *AOF.* II, 74 *ff.* who connects it with the Assy. *šarrâḳu*, to which he assigns the value "desert," "wilderness"; but see Muss-Arnolt, *Dict. s. v.*, where the meaning "thief" is clearly established for *šarrâḳu* by the passages cited.

---

* Ke., Casp..

† Ry..

‡ Schegg.

§ Hi., Reinke, van H..

§ 19. *Israel's Lamentation Over the Faithlessness Among Her People* (7^{1-6}).

This section is a group of six four-line strs. which bewail the general depravity in Israel. **Str. I** laments the state of general weakness into which Israel has fallen. **Str. II** accounts for this weakness by describing the wickedness universal in Israel. **Str. III** exposes the covetousness and bribery prevalent among the ruling classes. **Str. IV** declares their condition to be hopeless and their day of punishment to be close at hand. **Strs. V** and **VI** rise to a climax in the denunciation of sin, by showing that no man dare trust even his most intimate friends and nearest relatives.

WOE is me! for I am become
Like the gatherings of summer fruit, like the gleanings of the vintage.
There is not a cluster to eat,
Not an early fig that my soul desires.
THE pious has perished from the land,
And of the upright among men there is none.
All of them lie in wait for blood,
Each hunts his brother with a net.

TO do evil they have made ready their hands;
The prince demands a bribe,
And the great man expresses the desire of his soul;
He . . . and they weave it.
THE best of them are like a brier;
The most upright of them like a hedge.
The day of their visitation comes;
Now will be their havoc.
PUT no confidence in a friend;
Trust not an intimate;
From her that lies in thy bosom,
Guard the doors of thy mouth.
FOR a son insults his father;
A daughter rises up against her mother;
The daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law;
A man's enemies are the men of his own house.

The measure of the poem is prevailingly trimeter, falling occasionally to dimeter as in Str. IV, lines 1 and 2, and rising once to tetrameter, viz. Str. II, line 4. The text of Str. III is badly preserved and has thus far defied restoration. The strophic norm of the piece is already fixed by vv. $^{1.2}$ which fall naturally into four lines each (*cf.* Siev., Du.); the same metre fits well throughout, with the exception of Str. III, where the text is beyond recovery.

The fact that the style changes in v. ^{5} from that of a lament to that of an address is insufficient reason for separating vv. $^{5.6}$ as a parallel from the original piece (vv. $^{1-4}$), with Marti (*cf.* Du., Hpt.), or for eliminating v. ^{5} and transposing v. ^{6} to follow v. ^{3}, with Siev. and Gu.. Change of persons is a very common phenomenon in Hebrew discourse (*cf.* Kö. *Stilistik*, 238 *ff.*), as is also the change from one style of address to another, *e. g.* from apostrophe or direct address to narrative (Ps. 34^{4-6} 45^{12-14} Is. $24^{16\ f.}$). Looked upon as an announcement of coming disaster, the piece, of course, finds its most natural conclusion in Str. IV. But disaster is only incidental in this prophecy. Its main burden is rather that of grief for Israel's pitiable plight. Vv. $^{5.6}$ consequently form an eminently fitting conclusion. The picture of universal disloyalty, even in the most sacred and intimate human relationships, is the true climax. What can compare with this as a just cause for lamentation?

The time to which the prophecy belongs is difficult to discover. This section is wholly independent logically of both the preceding and the following. Yet it is generally conceded that 6^{9-16} and 7^{1-6} might easily have come from the same time and the same pen. The same moral and religious situation in general is reflected in both passages. The fact that the judgment is looked upon as still to come (7^{4}) is consistent with origin in the time of Micah; but it is not inconsistent with postexilic origin (*cf.* Zc. $13^{7\ ff.}$ $14^{1\ f.}$ Mal. $3^{5\ f.}$). The charge against the ruling classes (v. ^{3})

is likewise explicable upon either basis (*cf.* $3^{1\,\text{ff.}}$ Zc. $11^{1\,\text{ff.}}$ Zp. 3^3). The general condition of depravity pictured here, and especially the faithlessness so widely prevalent are more easily accounted for in the postexilic period than at any previous time (*cf.* Is. 59^{1-8} 56^9–57^2 Mal. $2^{11\,\text{ff.}}$ 4^5 Ps. 12, 14). But a fuller knowledge of the history of Israelitish life than is now accessible to us might show other periods when such conditions prevailed.

1. כְּאָסְפֵּי] 𝔊 *συνάγων*; so 𝔙; hence Elh. כְּאֹסֵף or כְּאֹסְפֵי; so Now., van H., Du., Hpt.. Siev. כְּאֹסַפְתִּי, *i.e.* prtc. with old fem. ending; so Gu.. Hal. בְּאָסְפֵּי.—כעללת] Now. וְעֹלֵלֹת. Hal. בְּעֹלֵלֹת; so van H.. Elh. כאֹסְפֵי עֹלֵלֹת. Pont, עֹלֵלֹת, dropping כ. Siev. כִּמְעֹלַלְתִּי, fem. prtc.; so Gu.. Hpt. כְּעֹלְלֵי.—אוהה] 𝔊 *οἴμοι* = אויה, or אוי.—בכורה] Gu. אין ב׳.—נפשי] Marti, נפש, foll. 𝔊. Nine codd. of 𝔊 have a double rendering, viz. *ἡ ψυχή μου οἴμοι ψυχή*.—**2.** אבד] Aq., Σ Θ *ἐκλέλοιπεν*.—לדמים] 𝔖 om. but substitutes the cog. acc. after יארבו.—יארבו] 𝔊 *δικάζονται* = יָרִיבוּ.—את] Gr. אֶל.—יצודו] 𝔊 *ἐκθλίβουσιν* = יצורו.—חרם] 𝔊 *ἐκθλιβῇ*, perhaps a free rendering. 𝔙 *ad mortem*. 𝔗 𝔖 *to destruction*. Aq., Σ *ἀναθέματι*. Du. הֶרִימוּ. Perles, הִנָּם; so Marti, Now.^{K} (?), Gu..—**3.** עַל הרע] Rd., with Marti, לְהָרַע; so Now.^{K}, Siev., Gu., Du., Hpt.. 𝔙 treats as in cstr. with כפ׳, notwithstanding the article, and makes the whole phrase the obj. acc. of היטיב.—כפים] Rd. כַּפֵּיהֶם, with 𝔊 𝔙 𝔖; so Dathe, Bauer, Seb., We., Ru., Now., Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, Marti, Siev., Gu., Hpt.. Hal. פָּנִים.—להיטיב] Rd. הֵיטִיבוּ, with 𝔊 *ἑτοιμάζουσιν*, 𝔙 *dicunt bonum;* so Bauer, Taylor, We., Marti, Now.^{K}, Siev., Gu., Hpt.. 𝔖 𝔗 insert a negative before the inf. and treat inf. as a prtc. or finite form. 𝔖 has double rendering of היטיב, viz. *for evil they make ready their hands, and they do not good*.—שאל] 𝔖 adds, *give*.—והשפט בַּ׳] Om., with Marti, as a gloss on השר; so Now.^{K}, Siev., Gu.. 𝔖 𝔗 *and the judge says*. Now. adds שֹׁפֵט. Van H. om. ו and makes ש׳ obj. acc. of שאל.—בשלום] 𝔊 *εἰρηνικοὺς λόγους*. 𝔙 *in reddendo est*. Σ *ἐν ἀνταποδόσει*. 𝔖 *give a bribe*.—הגדול] 𝔊 om.—דבר] 𝔊 *ἐλάλησεν*. Σ *λαλεῖ*.—הות] One cod. אות; so Gr.. Marti, Now.^{K}, הַוָּתוֹ. Siev., Gu. רַוַּת.—נפשו הוא] Marti, הַמִּשְׁפָּט; so Now.^{K}. Siev., Gu. וּמִשְׁפָּט כְּנַפְשׁוֹ.—ויעבתוה] 𝔊 *καὶ ἐξελοῦμαι*. 𝔙 *conturbaverunt eam*. 𝔖 connects with v. ^{4} and renders, *and they reject their good* = ויתעבו. Σ *καὶ κατὰ τὰς δασεῖς ἡ δασύτης αὐτοῦ*. We. וַיְעַוְּתוּהָ; so Gr., Marti, Now.^{K}. Siev., Gu. יְעַוֵּת. Hal. וַיַּצְדִּקֻהוּ. Ro. וַיַּעַבְתוּ; so Elh., Pont, van H.. Du. וַיְעַוְּתוּ.—הוא] Hpt. יאחזו.—**4.** טובם] Ro. connects with v. ^{3}, foll. 𝔖, and reads הטובים, using the suffix of the preceding vb.; so Elh., Pont, van H., Hpt..—כחדק] 𝔊 *ὡς σὴς ἐκτρώγων* = כְּחֹרֵק. Aq. *ὡς βολίς* 𝔙 *quasi paliurus*. 𝔖 *like a rag*. 𝔗 *as from a thornbush*. We. מחדק.—ישר] Rd. יְשָׁרָם, with Jus., Houb., Dathe, Bauer, We., Gr., Now., Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, Marti, Hal., Siev., Gu., Du.. 𝔊 *καὶ βαδίζων*. 𝔖 *which is torn in pieces*.—ממסוכה] Rd. כִּמְסוּכָה; so Taylor, Pont, Gr., Now., Marti, Siev., Gu., Du.; כ and מ

have been confused here as in 1^{12}; *cf.* 𝔙, Σ, 𝔊. 𝔊 *ἐπὶ καυνος* = כִּמְשׂוּרָה. Σ *ὡς ἐξ ἐμφραγμοῦ.* 𝔖 *by the moth*, a conjectural rendering of a misunderstood text. 𝔙 *quasi spina de sepe.*—יום] 𝔊 *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ.* Marti, Siev., Gu. om. as gloss.—מצפיך] Om. as gloss, with Marti, Now.^{K}, Siev., Gu.. 𝔊 *σκοπιᾶς.* 𝔙 *speculationis tuae.* 𝔖 *thy watchmen.* Taylor, מִצְּפֶיךָ. Ru. מְצַפֵּיהֶם. Gr. צֹפֶיךָ.—פקדתך] Rd. פְּקֻדָּתָם, with Marti, Siev., Now.^{K}, Gu., Du.. Ru. and Now. om. as gloss upon מצפיך. 𝔊 *οὐαὶ οὐαί, αἱ ἐκδικήσεις σου*; hence Marti, Siev., Now.^{K}, Du. and Gu. insert הוי before פק׳.—מבוכתם] 𝔊 *κλαυθμοὶ αὐτῶν*, deriving from בכה, *weep;* similarly 𝔖. 𝔙 *vastitas eorum.* Cod. 17 (Kenn.) מבוסתם; so Ru.. Hal. מְבוּסָה.—**5.** רע . . . אלוף] 𝔊 𝔖 pl..—𝔊 𝔖 render v. ^{5b} very freely, *e. g.* 𝔊, *from thy bedfellow, beware of entrusting anything to her*—**6.** איבי] 𝔊 *ἐχθροὶ πάντες.*

Str. I introduces Zion bewailing in figurative speech the total absence of righteousness and truth among her people.—**1.** *Woe is me! for I am become like the gatherings of the summer fruit, like the gleanings of the vintage*] Zion is the speaker; the language is wholly inappropriate in the mouth of Yahweh; nor is it to be easily attributed to the prophet himself. Zion is as when the fruit harvest and the vintage are completely gathered.—*There is not a cluster to eat, not an early fig that my soul desires*] It is unnecessary to drop the suffix and render "that any one desires," with Marti. The figure is perfectly intelligible as it stands in 𝔐. This clause shows that Zion does not identify herself with or liken herself to the bare vineyards and orchards, but rather to one appearing upon the scene seeking fruit after it is all gone. This pregnant use of the particle of comparison is common in Hebrew, *e. g.* Ps. 18^{43} Jb. 38^{30} Gn. 34^{31}.

Str. II expresses the same thought as **Str. I**, but in plain, unmistakable terms. "There is none that doeth good, no not one."—**2.** *The pious has perished from the land, and of the upright among men there is none*] *Cf.* Ps. 12^{2} Is. 57^{1}. The term "pious" does not appear prior to the time of Jeremiah and Deuteronomy; it occurs chiefly in Psalms. It emphasises the practical side of religion as it finds expression in kindness and loyalty toward men. The "pious" and "upright" are the grapes and figs of **Str. I**. The term "land" applies to Israel only, not to the world at large; and the comprehensive term "man" includes only such representatives of the race as are to be found in Israel. The prophet has no concern here with the world in general and passes no judgment upon it. Israel absorbs all his interest.—*All of them lie in wait for blood*] *Cf.* Ho. $6^{8.\,9}$. The figure of the hunter and his prey is here applied to the devices whereby one Israelite takes advantage of another for his own profit.—*Each hunts his brother with a net*] *Cf.* Hb. $1^{15\,f.}$ Ec. 7^{26}. The hunter's net rather than the fisherman's is probably meant here. The greed of the people stops short at nothing; fraternal obligations are ignored and violated in the mad rush for gain.

Str. III specifies distinctly the kind of crimes the prevalence of which Zion is bewailing, viz. bribery of the courts of justice and consequent perversion of law and justice.—**3.** *To do evil they have made ready their hands*] 𝔐 is untranslatable. It has been rendered: "besides doing evil thoroughly with their hands";* "on account of the misdeed of the hands—to make it good—the prince, etc.";† "their hands go out to evil, to do it earnestly";‡ "they reach out both hands after evil to make it good";§ "their hands are upon that which is evil to do it diligently."** But the grammatical difficulties are insuperable. The thought of the text as emended is that of Je. 4^{22} 13^{23}. It is the deliberate purpose of the accused to do evil; they have trained and equipped themselves to that end.—*The prince demands a bribe*] *i. e.* in his capacity as judge; *cf.* 2 S. $15^{2\,ff.}$ 1 K. $3^{16\,ff.}$. Bribery is still the outstanding vice of oriental governments. 𝔐 inserts *and the judge* after "the prince," a gloss indicating the prince's judicial function. An interesting attempt to interpret 𝔐 is that of Prof. Morris Jastrow,†† who would assign to the participle שׁאל the meaning "priest," *i. e.* one who seeks oracles, and would treat בשׁלום as a corruption of some verb, so getting the rendering, "the prince, the priest and the judge. . . ." But ingenious as this is, it fails because such a use of this participle in Hebrew cannot be established, and because the parallel הגדול with its participle הדבר demands a similar construction here.—*And the great man expresses the desire of his soul*] The rich and powerful make known their wishes, and these are carried into effect by the courts, whose judgments are for sale to the highest bidder. The word "desire" is always used of evil wishes. It is possible that "the great man" is an official and that the meaning of the phrase is, "the great man decides according to his own wicked desires." The pronoun הוא must be taken with this line if 𝕸 is correct; the rendering then would be, "and as for the great man, he expresses the desire of his soul," the pronoun being emphatic; but the length of the line thereby produced and the unnecessary emphasis are against 𝕸's arrangement. The pronoun has been taken as intensifying the suffix, viz. "desire of his own soul"; but this is un-Hebraic. It seems best to regard הוא as a fragment of the first part of the following line which has been lost or corrupted beyond recognition.—*He . . . and they weave it*] This line is partly missing, and what remains is obscure. The verb occurs only here, and its meaning must be conjectured from the substantives "leafy" and "cord," formed from the same root, and from the context here. The emendation "pervert" (*v. s.*) is attractive, but in so uncertain a context no certainty as to details is possible. The suffix apparently refers to the wicked desire of the great, while the subject must be the combined classes represented by "the prince" and "the great man," who together overcome all opposition and circumvent the righteous poor.

---

* Rosenm..

† Ew..

‡ Or..

§ Um.; similarly Casp., Ke..

** RV..

†† *JBL.* XIX, 95 *f.*.

Str. IV in its first half summarises the denunciation up to the present point, and in its second half threatens the wicked oppressors with punishment.—**4.** *The best of them are like a brier*] *Cf.* 2 S. $23^{6.\,7}$. The comparison is probably double-edged, having reference to the roughness and sharpness of briers and also to their susceptibility to quick combustion; *cf.* Ex. 22^{6} Is. 9^{18} 10^{17}.—*The most upright of them like a hedge*] For text, *v. s.*. 𝕸 = "more just than a hedge," which is nonsense. RV. "the most upright is worse than a thorn-hedge" cannot possibly be derived from 𝕸; while RVm., "the straightest is as it were taken from a thorn-hedge" is no better. Whether the hedge is mentioned as suggesting an obstruction or injurious roughness cannot be determined; *cf.* Pr. 15^{19}.—*The day of their visitation comes, now will be their havoc*] The day of Yahweh is here before the prophet's mind, that great day of judgment that engaged the attention of the prophets from first to last; *cf.* Is. 22^{5}. Hence a gloss makes 𝕸 read, *the day of thy watchmen* (*i. e. thy prophets*), *thy visitation comes*] which is poor Hebrew. The suffix must agree with those of the preceding and following lines.

Str. V abandons the form of the lament wholly and passes over into direct address, cautioning each Israelite to beware of treachery, even in the heart of his most dearly beloved.—**5.** *Put no confidence in a friend; trust not an intimate*] From the friend in general (רֵעַ) to the bosom friend (אַלּוּף), the prophet proceeds in ascending scale; none is worthy of confidence, not even a man's wife.—*From her that lies in thy bosom guard the doors of thy mouth*] There is no hint here of any intention to cast a slur upon womankind in general as unable to keep a secret; it is simply the crowning proof of the universal faithlessness. Roorda's view that v.^{5} depicts not existing conditions, but those that shall supervene in the "day of their visitation," is wholly without foundation; *cf.* v. ^{2d}.

Having uttered the warning in **Str. V** the prophet proceeds in **Str. VI** to state the facts which warrant his advice.—**6.** *For son insults father*] A heinous offence in Semitic eyes; *cf.* Code of Hammurabi, §§ 186, 192, 195; Ex. 20^{12} $21^{15.\ 17}$ Dt. $21^{18\,\mathrm{ff.}}$ Lv. 20^{9} Pr. 20^{20}.—*Daughter rises up against her mother*] The submissiveness of the daughter to her parents is well illustrated by the marriage customs in accordance with which the daughter's hand was absolutely at the disposal of her father; *cf.* Gn. 31^{15}. Her subjection was more complete than that of the son; consequently her insubordination would be correspondingly more shocking.—*The daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law*] The ideal relationship between mother-in-law and son's wife is revealed to us by the story of Ruth and Naomi. The mother was granted absolute authority over her son's wife.—*A man's enemies are the men of his own house*] Not merely his servants or slaves; but also, and chiefly, his nearest relatives, the members of his own family. With vv. $^{5.\ 6}$, *cf.* Ovid, *Metamorph.* I, 144 *ff.*.

1. אַלְלַי] Again in Jb. 10^{15}; both times expressive of grief; *cf.* Assy. *allû;* Kö. $^{\mathrm{II.\ p.\ 336}}$.—אָסְפִּי] On d., *cf.* Sta. $^{\S\ 71.\ 2)}$.—אין איש'] Circumstantial clause, with the force of the negative continuing in foll. clause.—לֶאֱכֹל] Inf. with לְ has force of a gerundive; *cf.* Kö. $^{\S\ 406\ a}$.—אוֹתָהּ נ'] Rel.

clause with rel. particle omitted; Ges. $^{\S 155 n}$.—**2.** חרם] Acc. of instrument Ges. $^{\S 117 ff}$. Kö. $^{\S 332 u}$; this is the sole example of this construction, but analogous usage is found in Ju. 19^5 Ps. 5^{13} 51^{14}.—**3.** בשלום] Acc. to 𝔐 this is dependent upon שאל, which is to be understood with השפט; but שאל ב׳ always applies to the consulting of deity through oracles, which is unsuitable here. ב׳ is probably due to the editor who inserted השפט and was intended by him as ב of price.—נפשו הוא] Treated by Ges. $^{\S 135 f}$. Kö. $^{\S 19}$ as a pron. strengthening the sf.; but such prons. are usually introduced by גם (*cf.* 1 K. 21^{19}); *cf.*, however, Zc. 7^5 Dt. 5^3.—**4.** באה] Agreeing with the nearer noun, rather than with יום, the real subj..—**5.** שכבת ח׳] Genitive, instead of acc. of place, or prep. ב, seems to imply a closer relationship; *cf.* Kö. $^{\S 336 p}$.—פתחי] The pl. by metonymy, instrument for product; *cf.* Kö. $^{\S 260 e}$.

§ 20. *The Discomfiture of the Foe* (7^{7-10}).

In four strs. of four lines each, the prophet expresses his conviction that Yahweh will vindicate his people by overthrowing their enemies. The poem sounds somewhat like an imprecatory psalm. **Str. I** warns the enemy not to rejoice too prematurely, for Israel's distress is only temporary. **Str. II** expresses the resolution to bear Yahweh's chastisement uncomplainingly, since it is due to sin and will end in Israel's vindication. **Str. III** declares that the tables are to be turned upon Israel's enemies; those who have reviled her will themselves be put to shame.—**Str. IV** announces a time when those who scoffed at Israel's God because of Israel's calamities will in their turn be ground down by oppression.

REJOICE not, O mine enemy, over me!
Though I am fallen, I shall arise.
Though I sit in darkness,
Yahweh will be my light.
THE anger of Yahweh I must bear—
For I have sinned against him—
Until he shall take up my cause,
And execute my right.
HE will bring me forth to the light;
I shall gaze upon his righteousness.
And mine enemy will see,
And shame will cover her;
SHE that said unto me,
Where is Yahweh, thy God?
Mine eyes will gaze upon her;
Now will she be for trampling.

There are traces of the *qîna* rhythm in this poem; but the interchange of trimeter and dimeter is too irregular to permit us to classify the poem as elegiac. This may be seen from Siev.'s attempt (*cf.* also Du.) at such an arrangement which involves three changes for metrical reasons only as well as the omission of the first two lines of Str. III as a gloss in tetrameter. The parall. is beautifully regular and the logic unfailingly indicates the strophic divisions.

The general period to which the poem belongs is manifest. Israel is no longer awaiting punishment as in 7^{1-6}, but is already enduring it, and is hoping for deliverance. This points naturally to exilic or post-exilic conditions. There is the same acknowledgment of the justice of the punishment as in Is. 40–55, and the same conviction that deliverance will come. But the attitude toward the heathen foe is not that of the Servant passages toward the world in behalf of which Israel suffers, but rather that of the later prophets who had become bitter against their oppressors; *cf.* Is. $63^{1 \text{ ff.}}$ Zc. $14^{12 \text{ ff.}}$ Ob. $^{15 \text{ f.}}$. No satisfactory connection can be found for v. ^{7} either with the preceding section or with this. It seems to be a misplaced fragment.

7. ואני] Siev. om..—אוחילה] 𝔗 אֲרוּג, deriving it from חול.—ישעי] 𝔊 *τῷ σωτῆρί μου*; so 𝔖 𝔙. Siev. supposes the omission of a trimeter line from 𝔐 at this point.—**8.** לי] Siev. tr. to precede איבתי; *cf.* 𝔊.—אור לי] 𝔊 *φωτιεῖ μοι*; so Θ 𝔗 𝔖; several mss. *φῶς μοι*.—**9.** עַד אשר] Du. עוּד.—אראה] Some Heb. mss. ואראה; so 𝔖.—**10.** איו] We. אַיֵּה; so Now., Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, Siev..—יהוה] 𝔖 om..—עתה] Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$ עֵת. Siev. כִּי.

Str. I serves warning upon Israel's foes that her present misfortunes will soon give place to honour and glory from Yahweh, her God.—**7.** *But I will watch expectantly for Yahweh, I will hope for the God of my deliverance; my God will help me*] The original connection of this verse with another context is shown by the manner in which it evidently contrasts "I" with something that has gone before, though there is no fitting contrast in the present context.* The presence of this fragment here may be due to an effort to establish some connection between vv. ^{6} and ^{8}. The speaker here is apparently not an individual, but the oppressed community, which gives expression to its unquenchable faith in Yahweh as the source of ultimate deliverance. For similar phraseology, *cf.* Ps. 5^{4} 18^{47} 25^{5} 38^{16} 43^{5} Hb. 3^{18}. The original poem begins with v. ^{8}.—**8.** *Rejoice not, O mine enemy, over me!*] "Enemy" is collective here, including all of Israel's foes; *cf.* Ob. $^{12 \text{ ff.}}$

---

* *Cf.* Du. who attaches v. ^{7} to vv. $^{5, 6}$.

CONCORDIA COLLEGE LIBRARY
BRONXVILLE, N. Y. 10708

Ps. 25^{2} 35^{19}.—*Though I am fallen, I shall arise*] Faith under difficulties, the certainty of final vindication, was characteristic of all the exilic and postexilic prophets; *cf.* Is. $60^{1\,\text{ff.}}$ Ez. 37–39 Zc. 14.—*Darkness . . . light*] A common figure for calamity and prosperity; *cf.* Am. 5^{18} Is. $62^{1\,\text{ff.}}$ $9^{1\,\text{ff.}}$ 58^{10} 59^{9} Jb. 30^{26}.

In **Str. II** the speaker declares himself ready to bear patiently the well-merited punishment of Yahweh until such time as Yahweh may choose to release him.—**9.** *The anger of Yahweh I must bear*] This is in accord with all Semitic thought which always explained disaster as due to divine wrath.* From the time of Josiah's untimely death on, the consciousness of being under the wrath of Yahweh was a heavy burden upon Israel; *cf.* 2 K. $23^{26\,\text{f.}}$ 24^{20} Is. $42^{24\,\text{f.}}$.—*For I have sinned against him*] A parenthetical statement of the occasion of the divine anger. Sin and punishment are indissolubly united in Hebrew and Semitic thought. There is in this ascription of the disasters of Israel to Yahweh's anger because of her sin a direct rebuke of the foes who have failed to realise in their unholy glee that they are but instruments in the hand of a just God.—*Until he shall take up my cause and execute my right*] There is a limit to Yahweh's wrath; *cf.* Ps. 103^{9}. Though he is now angry at Israel, yet when his punitive purpose is accomplished he will take his place as Israel's avenger over against her foes. As compared with them, Israel is righteous; Yahweh therefore will not allow them to push her to destruction; *cf.* Zc. $1^{15\,\text{f.}}$.

Str. III contrasts the fact of Israel's vindication with its necessary corollary, the public humiliation of her foes.—**9e, f.** *He will bring me forth to the light; I shall gaze upon his righteousness*] The "righteousness" of Yahweh, as in Is. 40–55, is here identical with the vindication of Israel. Israel being more nearly in accordance with the divine will than the nations are who triumph over her, it is required of the justice of Yahweh that he deliver his people and punish their oppressors who have exceeded their commission of chastisement upon Israel. The destruction of Israel by the heathen nations would be wholly inconsistent with the character of the God of justice. His righteousness demands Israel's triumph over her foes.—**10a, b.** *And mine enemy will see, and shame will cover her*] Israel's vindication would be incomplete apart from the disgrace of her enemies. The latter is involved in the former. But to say with Caspari that Israel's joy is a holy exultation over the overthrow of the enemies of God does not tell the whole story. Such an element is undoubtedly present, but there is coupled with it the element of revenge for wanton and gross insults long endured; *cf.* Na. 3 Ps. 109 and Ob..

---

* *Cf. Meša-Inscription*, l. 5; the *Stele of Nabonidus*, l. 1 *ff.*

Str. IV announces the complete and final overthrow of the enemies of Israel and Yahweh.—**10c-f.** *Where is Yahweh, thy God?*] A proverbial expression indicative of the powerlessness of Yahweh; *cf.* 2 K. 18^{34} Jo. 2^{17} Ps. 79^{10} 115^{2}. Among peoples entertaining a limited conception of deity as the champion of a particular nation, the continuous disaster of a nation must always be interpreted as due to the weakness of its patron deity.—*Mine eyes will gaze upon her*] She who doubted Yahweh's power, if not his very existence, will now feel that power in her own person. The "gaze" is one of gloating hatred; *cf.* Ob. $^{12.\ 13}$ Ez. 28^{17} Ps. 22^{18}.—*Now will she be for trampling*] A final note of triumph over the prostrate foe.—*Like the mire of the streets*] An editorial expansion, as is shown by the metre;* for similar additions, *cf.* 1^{4}.

8. איבתי] Fem. as collective, Ges.$^{\S 122\,s}$.—**9.** זעף] Of anger of ׳י, only here and Is. 30^{30}; a stronger term than the more common אף, זעם and עברה.—עשה משפטי] *i. e. do me justice, give judgment in my favour; cf.* Ps. 9^{5}.—**10.** וְתֵרֶא] An abnormal form and accentuation, but found also in Zc. 9^{5} and Gn. 41^{33} (in some mss.). According to Ges.$^{\S 75\,p}$ due to desire to avoid hiatus before foll. א; but perhaps better treated as reflecting Aramaic usage, Ges.$^{\S 75\,hh}$. On the force of the tense, *cf.* Kö. $^{\S 364\,f.}$.—איו] Correction to איה is unnecessary in view of 2 K. 19^{13} Is. 19^{12} Je. 37^{19}; the sf. vividly anticipates the subj.; *cf.* Kö.$^{\S 340\,l}$.—תִּרְאֶינָּה] D. f. *affectuosum*, as in תַּעֲנֶינָּה, Ju. 5^{29}; Ges.$^{\S 75\,w}$. There is no room here for a sf..

---

* So Marti, Now.^{K}, Siev., Hpt.. But *cf.* Du., who retains it and drops "mine eyes will gaze upon her."

§ 21. *The Restoration of Jerusalem and the Return of Exiles* (7^{11-13}).

A single eight-line str. tells of the time when the city's walls will be rebuilt, her borders extended and her citizens brought back from every quarter of the earth; while the heathen world will receive drastic punishment for the sin of its inhabitants.

A DAY will there be for rebuilding thy walls.
On that day the border will be distant.
A day will there be when unto thee will they come,
From Assyria even unto Egypt,
And from Egypt even to the river,
And from sea to sea and from mountain to mountain.
But the earth will become a desolation,
On account of its inhabitants, because of the fruit of their deeds.

Tetrameter rhythm prevails in this oracle as it is found in 𝔐; but the text is doubtful at several points. The connection within the str. is very close, except between vv. ^{12} and ^{13}, where contrast must be understood to make any connection possible. But since good connection may be secured in this way, it seems unnecessary to separate v. ^{13}, either in order to connect it with v. ^{18} (Marti) or with v. ^{4} (Siev.). There is not the slightest link of connection between this passage and its context on either side. The proposition of Marti (so also Now.^{K}) to secure connection with vv. $^{7-10}$ by changing the sf. of the 2d pers. here to that of the 1st pers. does not commend itself, for such promises for the future are ordinarily spoken to the community or concerning it by a prophet and do not emanate from the community itself. Van H.'s proposal to place vv. $^{11b-13}$ immediately after v. ^{6}, involves an impossible exegesis of v. ^{12}. The passage is, therefore, a fragment lacking close relationship to the other fragments of which chs. 6 and 7 are composed (so also Du.).

The time of the writing of this piece is clearly revealed as falling within certain limits. The *terminus a quo* for its origin is necessarily the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C., at which time the walls of the city were razed (2 K. 25^{10}); the *terminus ad quem* is evidently the year of the rebuilding of the walls under Nehemiah. The prophet apparently looks forward to the rebuilding as close at hand; hence we might place the prophecy shortly before that task was actually begun. But it is impossible to say how many times prophetic hopes of this character may have been kindled only to meet with disappointment. It is unsafe, therefore, to specify any time within the first century and a half after the fall of Jerusalem for the utterance of this prophecy.

11. יום] Add הוא, with Marti and Now.^{K}, as copula; *cf.* v.^{12}. Che.^{CB}, ביום ההוא.—לבנות] 𝔊 *ἀλοιφῆς πλίνθου* = לְבֵנוּת. Siev. הַבָּנוּת.—גדריך] 𝔊 *ἐξάλειψίς σου.* Marti, גְּדֵרָי; so Now.^{K}, Siev.. Hal. גְּדֵרֵיךְ.—יום ההוא] Siev. om..—ירחק חק] 𝔊 *καὶ ἀποτρίψεται νόμιμά σου.* 𝔖 *that thou be taken away*, omitting חק. 𝔙 *longe fiet lex.* Aq. *μακρυνθήσεται ἡ ἀκρισία.* Σ *μακρὰν ἔσται ἡ ἐπιταγή.* Gr. יִרְחַק דָּחֹק. Oort$^{Em.}$ יִרְחָקוּךְ. Marti, יר׳ חֻקָּי; so Now.^{K}, Siev.. Hpt. יקרב חֻקּוֹ. Du. יִרְחַף ח׳.—**12.** וְעָדֶיךָ] Rd. וְעָרַיִךְ, in agreement with v.^{11}; so Now., Hpt.. 𝔊 Θ *καὶ αἱ πόλεις σου* = ועריך. 𝔖 *thy time.* Marti, וְעָדַי; so Now.^{K}, Siev..—יבוא] Rd. יָבֹאוּ, with 𝔊, We., Taylor, Gr., Now., Marti, Siev., Hpt..—למני] 𝔊 *εἰς ὁμαλισμὸν καὶ εἰς διαμερισμόν.*—ועדי] Rd. וְעָרֵי, with Aq. Θ Ew., Hi., Mau., Ro., Now., Elh., We., Gu., GASm., Oort$^{Em.}$, Marti, Siev., van H., Du., Hpt.. Taylor, וְיָדַי. Gr. וְעַד.—מצור] 𝔊 𝔖 𝔙 𝔗 take as common noun.—ולמני מצור] 𝔊 *εἰς διαμερισμὸν ἀπὸ Τύρου* = לְמִנִּי מִצּוֹר; so 𝔖.—וים] Elh. וימה.—והר] 𝔖 = וְהֹר; *cf.* Nu. 20^{22}. Elh. וההרה.—ההר] Rd. מֵהָר, with 𝔊 𝔙, Taylor, Elh., We., GASm., Now., Marti, Hal., van H., Du., Hpt..

This short poem is full of movement,—the rebuilding of walls, the exiles returning in great numbers from every quarter, and over against this scene of joyous activity the desolation of destruction upon the pagan world.—**11.** *A day will there be for rebuilding thy walls*] The city of Jerusalem is addressed. The language of the str. as a whole shows that the literal rebuilding of the city's walls is meant, rather than any such general idea as the restoration of the fortunes of Israel.—*On that day will the boundary be far distant*] *i. e.* Israel's territory will be very extensive. For רחק as applied to the extension of boundaries, *cf.* Is. 26^{15}. The boundary referred to may be either that of the city or that of the land; *cf.* Zc. 2^{4}. The text here is somewhat suspicious; חק without the article or other token of definiteness is unusual, and the repetition of יום and הוא in the first three lines is suggestive of dittography. Some would drop חק as a dittograph from the verb; but the resulting sentence, "that day is far distant," is wholly out of harmony with the optimism of the passage. Other interpretations of this phrase are:—"that day—distant is the date (חק)";* "the decree shall be extended," *i. e.* to include not only Babylon but all the countries around Judea and to provide for great numbers becoming proselytes to Judaism;† the limit separating Israel from the nations will be set aside and all the nations will come flocking to the people of

---

* Ew., Um..

† Hd..

God;* the Mosaic law will be surperseded;† חק = the principles of the heathen—after the captivity idolatry will be abolished;‡ חק = law and order—in the time foretold in vv. $^{1-6}$, with which vv. $^{11b-13}$ should be connected, all restraint will be cast off and anarchy will prevail.§ But these are all open to serious objection and are now generally abandoned in favour of the view adopted here.—**12.** *A day will there be when unto thee will they come from Assyria even unto Egypt*] Not a prediction of foreign invasion,** nor a promise of the conversion of the nations;†† but an assurance of the return of the Jewish exiles. The language of the verse presupposes the wide extent of the *diaspora;* the exiles are sojourners among all peoples. Assyria and Egypt are the extremities of the prophet's world on the east and west.—*And from Egypt even unto the river*] The river in question is the Euphrates; hence this clause is practically identical with the preceding.—*And from sea to sea, and from mountain to mountain*] The order of words is unusual in 𝔐 and the text of the last word unintelligible in this context; *v. s.*. No particular sea is alluded to; the expression is rather general and indefinite, and so intended to convey the impression of vastness of expanse. The interpretation of Hitzig and Orelli, which identifies the seas as the Mediterranean and the Dead Sea, and the mountains as a northern Hor (Nu. 34^{7}) and a southern Hor (Nu. 20^{23}), makes Canaan the whole of the territory covered by the description of v. $^{12\,c.\,d}$; but this is an anti-climax after v. ^{12b}. For similar descriptions of a world-wide restoration from exile, *cf.* Ez. 34^{13} Zc. 10$^{8\,\text{ff.}}$ Is. 27^{12} Ps. 107$^{2\,\text{f.}}$.—**13.** *But the earth will become a desolation*] In its present context, the land thus threatened cannot be Canaan; but must be the heathen world in general, the land of Israel's foes; *cf.* Je. 49$^{13.\,17}$ 50^{23} Zp. 2$^{13.\,15}$ Jo. 3^{19}.—*Because of its inhabitants, on account of the fruit of their deeds*] That the land should suffer because of the sins of its occupants is a common thought in the Scriptures; *cf.* 2 S. 21$^{1\,\text{ff.}}$ Is. 24^{5} Lv. 18^{25} Rom. 8^{22}. The final phrase more specifically defines the occasion of the land's devastation; for other examples of the phrase, *v.* Is. 3^{10} Je. 17^{10} 21^{14} 32^{19}; *cf.* Je. 6^{19}.

---

* Ke..

† Kl..

‡ Baur, Hal..

§ Van H..

** Van H..

†† Cal., Rosenm., Hesselberg, Mau., Kl..

11. יום לבנות] For בנה = *rebuild*, *cf.* Ez. $36^{10.\,33}$. The lack of copula would make it necessary to draw יום ההוא to this clause as its predicate (so Now.); but this violates the metrical norm; it is better to insert הוא.—יום ההוא] An acc. of time when. For lack of art. with יום, *cf.* Ges.$^{\S\,126\,w}$.—**12.** יום הוא] Lack of art. explained by Ges.$^{\S\,126\,aa}$ as due to corrupt text; by Kö.$^{\S\,334\,\beta}$ as due to prominent character of יום. But it is much better taken with יום as subj. of sentence and הוא as copula (*contra* Hpt.).—ועדיך] "and unto thee," *i. e.* "when unto thee"; *cf.* H. 44, 3.—מצור] Elsw. only Is. 19^{6} 2 K. 19^{24} (= Is. 37^{25}). Perhaps intended to suggest by its pointing the common noun, *siege*. Wkl.$^{\text{Unt.}}$, 170, proposes to point מִיצוּר or מְצוֹר, which he would connect with *Mi-iṣ-ṣa-ri* of the Tel-el-Amarna letters; *v.* Letter of *Ashur-uballit*, l. 2, and that of *Tar-ḫundaraš* of *Arṣapi*, l. 1.—נהר] Absence of art. = poetic usage, Kö.$^{\S\,295\,\varepsilon}$. For similar refs. to the Euphrates, *cf.* Zc. 9^{10} Ps. 72^{8} 1 K. $4^{21.\,24}$ 14^{15} 2 S. 10^{16} Gn. 15^{18} Dt. 1^{7}.—**13.** הארץ] As denoting all non-Israelitish territory, *cf.* the corresponding use of אָדָם in contrast with ישראל in Je. 32^{20}, cited by Stei. and Now..

§ 22. *A Prayer for Yahweh's Intervention* (7^{14-20}).

Three strs. of four lines each, in *qîna* rhythm, call for Yahweh's manifestation as the deliverer of his people and base the appeal for deliverance upon his mercy. **Str. I** is a prayer to Yahweh for the resumption of his former attitude of favour toward his people. **Str. II** prays for the utter humiliation of the heathen nations and their complete subjection to Yahweh. **Str. III** recalls the well-known character of Yahweh and reminds him of his oath to the patriarchs concerning the glory of Israel.

SHEPHERD thy people with thy staff, the flock of thine inheritance,
That dwells alone in a jungle, in the midst of a garden.
May they feed in Bashan and Gilead, as in the days of old.
As in the days of thy coming forth from Egypt, show us wonderful things.
MAY the nations see and be ashamed of all their might.
May they lay hand upon mouth, and may their ears be deaf.
May they lick dust like the serpent, like crawlers of the earth.
May they come trembling from their dens, may they quake and fear on account of thee.
WHO is a god like unto thee, forgiving iniquity and passing by transgression?
And thou wilt cast into the depths of the sea all our sins.
Thou wilt show faithfulness to Jacob and kindness to Abraham,
As thou hast sworn to our fathers from days of yore.

The *qîna* rhythm is clearly marked in this poem. Only three lines need pruning to bring them within the limits of the metre (*v. i.*), and the gloss-like character of these additions is very apparent. The three strs. are sharply differentiated one from another, the first dealing with Israel, the second with the nations, and the third with God. Siev. sets Str. III apart as an independent poem, but the identity of form and the good logical connection seem to require its junction with vv. $^{14-17}$. Sta. (*ZAW.* XXIII, 164 *ff.*), followed by Now. and Marti, has recognised that vv. $^{18b.\ 19a}$ interrupt the close connection between vv. ^{18a} and ^{19b} (*v. i.*). But these fragments have no real connection with v. ^{13}, where they are attached by Sta. and Marti. To put them there involves the application of v. ^{13} to the land of Israel, and a contrast between the condition portrayed in vv. $^{11-12}$ and that actually existing as described in v. ^{13}, which is hardly conceivable in the absence of any particle indicating the changed time relations. They are better treated as a variant or parallel to vv. $^{18a.\ 19b}$.

The general tone of this passage marks it as belonging to the later days. Israel is in distress; the land is only partly in its possession; the people have suffered many things at the hands of their enemies, upon whom they call down vengeance. The attitude of the author is quite similar to that revealed in vv. $^{8-10}$, and the two passages might well come from the same period, if not from the same pen. The return from exile seems to lie in the past; the people are dwelling in Canaan, but their territory is of narrow limits. The days when Bashan and Gilead were occupied (eighth century B.C.) are "days of old." This indicates a time after the return movement under Ezra and Nehemiah and the accompanying development of particularism. Many terms common in the later Psalms occur in these few verses (*v. i.*).

14. שכני] 𝔊 𝔖 𝔙 𝔗 pl. = שֹׁכְנֵי; so Ro., Sta. (*ZAW.* XXIII, 169), Elh., Now., Marti, Siev., van H., Hpt..—יער] 𝔖 = *sheep.* Hal. יִרְעֶ. Gr. כְּעֵדֶר. Van H. יֵעָר, *may it be established.*—**15.** צאתך] 𝔖 𝔗, sf. in 3d pl..—מארץ מצרים] Rd. ממצרים, omitting ארץ with 𝔊; so Marti, Siev., Du.; the metre supports this.—אראנו] Rd. הַרְאֵנוּ; so We., Taylor, Elh., Pont, Gr., GASm., Now., Che., Oort$^{Em.}$, Marti, Hal., Siev., van H., Du., Hpt.. 𝔊 *ὄψεσθε.* 𝔖 𝔗 sf. of 3d pers. pl.. Some codd. of 𝔊 *δείξω αὐτοῖς.* Ro. הַרְאֵנוּ; so Gu..—**16.** מכל] 𝔊 = ומכל.—יד] 𝔊 𝔖 𝔗 pl..—אזניהם] 𝔖 𝔗 𝔊^{A} and 3 Heb. mss. ואז'; so Taylor, Pont.—**17.** כנחש] 𝔊 𝔙 pl., but 𝔊^{AB} sg..—כזחלי] 𝔊 om. כ.—ממסגרתיהם] 𝔊 𝔙 = בְּמִס'; 𝔊 also has noun in sg.. 𝔖 *from their paths.*—אל־יהוה אלהינו יפחדו] Om. אל־י' אלהינו, with Marti, Now.^{K}, Siev., as a gloss; this is shown by the use of 3d pers. as compared with מִמֶּךָּ, and by the metre. It is not improbable that the entire phrase including יפחדו is an editorial citation from Ho. 3^5. This would leave a smoother text and an easier metre (*cf.* Siev.).—ויראו] Siev. om. mtr. cs..—ממך] 𝔖 om..—**18.** כמוך] Siev. adds יהוה, mtr. cs..—עון . . . פשע] 𝔊 𝔗 pl.. Siev. adds עמו after עון, mtr. cs..—לשארית נחלתו] Om. as gloss, with Now., Marti, Du.. Siev. and Gu.

עַל־חַטֹּאת נחלתך, and omit remainder of verse as gloss.—החזיק] 𝔖 2d pers. sg. —לעד] 𝔊 εἰς μαρτύριον = לָעֵד.—חפץ] 𝔖 has 2d pers. sg. of vb..—**19**. Siev. and Gu. insert אַתָּה at opening of verse, and change all vbs. to 2d pers. sg..—יכבוש] 𝔖 *and he will gather together*.—ותשליך] 𝔖 𝔗 𝔙 3d pers. sg. active. 𝔊 *καὶ ἀποριφήσονται*; but in some codd. of 𝔊, as in 𝔐. Ro. om. ו; so Marti.—חטאתם] Rd. חַטֹּאתֵינוּ, with 𝔊 𝔖 𝔙; so Ro., Elh., Pont, We., Gr., Gu., Now., Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, Marti, Hal., Siev., van H., Du..—**20**. תתן] 𝔊 *δώσει*. 𝔏 *dabis*, so some codd. of 𝔊. Siev. וְתִתֵּן.—אשר] Gu. כאשר.—מימי] 𝔊 *κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας* = כִּימֵי, confusing כ and מ as in 1^2.

Str. I is a prayer for Yahweh's favour upon Israel in the restoration to her of the territory once occupied by her.—**14.** *Shepherd thy people with thy staff, the flock of thine inheritance*] Yahweh is addressed as the shepherd of Israel; *cf.* Ps. 23 28^9 80^2 Gn. 49^{24}. On "flock of thine inheritance," *cf.* Is. 63^{17} Je. 10^{16} Ps. 74^2 95^7 100^3. Israel is frequently designated as Yahweh's "inheritance," *i. e.* as his possession, in Deuteronomy and subsequent writings; *cf.* Dt. 4^{20} $9^{26.\ 29}$ 32^9.—*Dwelling alone in a jungle in the midst of a garden*] This is not a prayer that Israel may be kept apart from the pagan nations,* but a statement of fact (as is shown by the participle) which serves as the occasion for the request of the previous line. Nor is it a description of Yahweh as having his home in a forest-shrine on Carmel, the sacred mountain.† It rather represents Israel as occupying the hill-tops of Judah, while access to the surrounding fertile plains is denied them, because the latter are in possession of powerful enemies. The sense is not materially changed if we translate, "dwelling alone, (like) a jungle in the midst of a garden"; but this division of the line is against the metre of the *qîna*. The "jungle" (GASm.) is here used as a symbol of barrenness and desolation, as in 3^{12} Ho. 2^{14} Is. 21^{13}, and in Is. 29^{17} 32^{15}, where it is contrasted with "garden" as here; *cf.* 2 K. 19^{23}. A reference to Israel as dwelling in the midst of Mt. Carmel would be unintelligible here.—*May they feed in Bashan and Gilead, as in days of old*] The reference to these regions is not necessarily indicative of the recent loss of this territory, and so proof of the origin of this prophecy before the fall of Samaria.‡ The phrase "days of old" renders this out of the question. The prophet living at a late day prays for the restoration of former glory, with reunited Israel once more occupying all of its long-lost territory, even that to the east of the Jordan.—**15.** *As in the days of thy going forth from Egypt, show us wonders*] 𝔐 "I will show him" is impossible in this connection. The prophet longs for a miraculous intervention; nothing else can give Israel the honour due her as Yahweh's people. The exodus of Israel is designated as a going forth of Yahweh, just as in Ju. 5[4]; *cf.* 2 S. 5[24] Ps. 60[10].

---

* *Contra* Sta. *ZAW*. XXIII, 169.

† So Hi..

‡ So van H..

Str. II indicates the character of the wonders which Israel desires Yahweh to perform, viz. the complete humiliation and demoralisation of the enemies.—**16.** *May the nations see, and be ashamed of all their might*] *i. e.* because their vaunted strength will seem so puny in comparison with the mighty deeds of Yahweh.—*May they lay hand upon mouth*] *i. e.* keep silent in astonishment and terror; *cf.* Ju. 18[19] Jb. 21[5] 29[9] 40[4] Pr. 30[32] Is. 52[15].—*And may their ears be deaf*] Deprived of both speech and hearing by the "thunder of his power" (Jb. 26[14]).—**17.** *May they lick dust like the serpent, like crawlers of the earth*] *i. e.* prostrate themselves to the earth before Yahweh in reverence. *Cf.* Gn. 3[14] Ps. 72[9] Is. 49[23].—*May they come trembling from their dens*] into which they have fled terror-stricken. *Cf.* Ps. 18[45].—*Unto Yahweh our God may they come quaking*] The phrase "unto Yahweh our God" belongs with this verb rather than with the preceding, as appears from the idiom פחד אל which occurs also in Ho. 3[5]; this is recognised in 𝔐 by the position of the verse accents.—*And may they fear on account of thee*] A fitting state of mind for those who have long jeered at Yahweh and oppressed his people; *cf.* Ps. 33[8] 67[8] 102[16].

Str. III closes the prophecy and the book with a tender appeal to Yahweh as the God of mercy and pardon that he will be gracious toward Israel in accordance with his ancient Covenant.—**18a.** *Who is a god like unto thee*] A common thought in Psalms, *e. g.* Ex. 15[11] Ps. 71[19] 77[14] 86[8] 89[7. 9] 96[4] 97[9]. Elsewhere, the point of the comparison is always the power of Yahweh; here only is it found in his quality of mercy. But Yahweh's power is the theme of vv. [15-17] and thus constitutes the background of the thought here.*—*Forgiving iniquity and passing by transgression*] Also a common thought in the Psalter, *e. g.* $86^{5.\ 15}$ 99^{8} $103^{3.\ 13}$ 130^{4}.—*To the remnant of his inheritance*] A gloss specifying and limiting the application of Yahweh's forgiving spirit to Israel, his chosen people. The inference to be drawn from this phase of Yahweh's character is plainly stated in the following comments attached by some editor.—**18b.** *He will not retain his anger for ever, for he delights in kindness*] The change from the *qîna* measure to simple trimeter and from the 2d person in address to Yahweh to the 3d person show the secondary character of this material. Similar phrases are frequent in the Psalter, *e. g.* 25^{10} 30^{6} 32^{10} 33^{5} 34^{9} $57^{4.\ 11}$.—**19a.** *He will again show us mercy*] Israel's past experience of Yahweh's grace warrants this conviction as to his purpose for the future.—*He will tread down our iniquities*] The sins of Israel are poetically pictured as enemies of Yahweh whom he will subdue and render powerless. The figure is striking and without parallel in the OT.. **19b.** *And thou wilt cast into the depths of the sea all our sins*] This is the continuation of v. ^{18a}. The prophet employs the strongest terms to express the conviction that Yahweh will fully forgive his people and restore them to the enjoyment of prosperity and power.—**20.** *Thou wilt show faithfulness to Jacob, kindness to Abraham*] The names of the forefathers of the nation are here applied to their descendants; the kind of treatment accorded the former may be confidently expected by the latter. *Cf.* Ex. 34^{6}.—*As thou hast sworn to our fathers from days of old*] Referring specifically, perhaps, to Gn. $22^{16\,\text{ff.}}$ $28^{13\,\text{f.}}$, and in general to all the promises through patriarchs and prophets throughout Israel's history.

---

* So Sta. *ZAW.* XXIII, 171.

14. שֹׁכְנִי] So-called *hireq-compaginis*, really the old genitive ending retained in the cstr.; *cf.* Ges.$^{\S\,90\,\text{m}}$; Kö.$^{\S\,272\,\text{b. c}}$. On account of difficulty of masc. prtc. agreeing with צאן (fem.), the reading as cstr. pl. is commonly accepted (*v. s.*), in agreement with coll. noun; *cf.* ירעו. But masc. may be explained as due to the force of עַם, the main noun to which צאן is added parenthetically; or as due to צאן itself being treated as masc., as in Gn. $30^{39\,\text{a}}$, because of its relation to עַם.—יער] Acc. of place in which, as after ישב in Gn. 18^{1}.—**15.** אַרְאֶנּוּ] Treated by Ew.$^{\S\,238}$ as Aram. form of imv.; this was objected to by Ew.'s contemporaries because an Aramaicism in the language of Micah was improbable; but this objection loses its force with the prevalence of the view of the late origin of this material. In any case it might have been due to a scribe who spoke Aram.. But more probably it was intended as first person of impf. by a scribe who conceived of v. ^{15} as the beginning of Yahweh's answer to Israel's petition, a view which is irreconcilable with the presence of the sf. in מִמֵּךְ (v. ^{17}).—**16.** יד על פה] A common idiom, hence without art., Kö.$^{\S 294 f.}$.—**18.** מִי] An example of the near relation of question to exclamation, Ges.$^{\S 148 c}$.—חָפֵץ] Verbal adj., rather than Qal pf., as shown by addition of הוּא.—**19.** יכבוש] This isolated usage of כבש suggests the possibility of a confusion with כבס, which would furnish excellent sense here and an idiom frequent in the OT.; *cf.* Is. 1^{16} Je. 4^{14} Ps. $51^{4.\ 9}$. כבס is used with the sense *wash away*, only in Lv. $13^{55\ f.}$; *cf.* רחץ, Is. 4^{4}. Hpt. makes this same suggestion in *AJSL*, July, 1910; but the preceding sentences were written a year before the appearance of that article.—**20.** אשר] = כאשר, as in Je. 33^{22} 48^{8} Is. 54^{9} Ps. 106^{34}.

A CRITICAL AND
EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON THE
BOOK OF ZEPHANIAH.

INTRODUCTION TO THE BOOK OF ZEPHANIAH.

§ I. FROM THE FALL OF THEBES TO THE FALL OF NINEVEH.

These two *termini* include the period of the decline and fall of the Assyrian empire. Within its limits belong the prophecies of both Zephaniah and Nahum. The difficulty and the greatness of their work can be properly appreciated only as we obtain an understanding of the course of events of which it formed a part. Judah, under Manasseh, continued the vassalage to Assyria that had been inaugurated by Ahaz, through his panic-stricken recourse to the aid of Tiglath-pileser III, and had been riveted upon Hezekiah by Sennacherib. Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal maintained the high prestige of Assyria throughout western Asia. The former had established her dominion over lower Egypt as far south as Memphis in 670 B.C., and had died (668 B.C.) while on the march to Egypt to drive back the Ethiopian Taharka, who had incited the Delta to revolt and was actively engaged in the attempt to free Egypt from the Assyrian yoke. Ashurbanipal (668–626 B.C.) immediately took up the unfinished task of his predecessor. His reign was the last blaze of Assyria's glory. Taharka was driven back into Nubia and Assyria's sway re-established over the Delta. Twenty kings of the Mediterranean littoral and the neighbouring islands, including Manasseh of Judah, hastened to renew their submission to Assyria. The irrepressible Taharka resumed his intrigues with the princes of the Delta soon after Ashurbanipal's return home and again stirred up revolt. The traitors were all severely punished by Ashurbanipal, with the exception of Necho, prince of Sais, who was shown honour and appointed Assyria's representative in charge of the whole of the Delta, being granted a body of Assyrian troops with which to maintain his authority.

This plan of organisation worked well for some time after the death of Taharka (663 B.C.). But in the third year of his successor, Tanutamon, negotiations were again opened between the princes of the Delta and the Ethiopian king, who attacked Necho and his Assyrian soldiers, inflicting defeat upon them and slaying Necho himself. In 661 B.C., Ashurbanipal despatched an expedition to Egypt which drove Tanutamon back into Ethiopia and seized and plundered Thebes, the ancient stronghold and capital. From this blow Thebes never recovered; though Tanutamon re-entered the city after the withdrawal of the Assyrian army and remained there until 654 B.C., when Psamtik, son of Necho and king of Sais and Memphis, expelled the Ethiopians and restored Thebes to Egyptian ownership.

While the Egyptian campaigns were draining Assyria of blood and treasure, Ashurbanipal was also compelled to wage a bloody war against Elam, which had resumed her former hostility shortly after his accession. Two campaigns reduced Elam to temporary submission, under the rule of princes appointed as Assyrian vassals (665 B.C.). Another draught upon Assyria's resources was occasioned by troubles in the far west, where Ba'al of Tyre had to be besieged and Arvad and Tabal brought to submission and tribute. Shortly afterward, Assyria's aid was besought by Arvad, Tabal and Lydia against the Cimmerians who had become aggressive.

An irremediable injury was done to the life of the Assyrian empire by the civil war instituted through the revolt of Ashurbanipal's brother, Shamash-shum-ukin, king of Babylon. The struggle was fierce and of seven years' duration, ending in 647 B.C. with the complete triumph of Ashurbanipal, who became king of Babylon under the name Kandalanu. Thereupon followed a series of campaigns against Elam, which had aided Shamash-shum-ukin. These resulted about 640 B.C. in the total destruction of Elam as a nation. The western peoples, who had eagerly seized upon the opportunity offered by the revolt of Babylon to rid themselves of the oppressive burden of vassalage to Nineveh, also required chastisement. The Arabian tribes, including the Kedarenes and Nabatæans, who had aided Shamash-shum-ukin, were brought into subjection by Ashurbanipal in a series of battles, in the course of which his troops overran the territory of the Kedarenes, Nabatæans, Edom, Moab, Ammon and the Hauran. Ushu and Acco, in Phœnicia, were also unmercifully punished. If any credence may be given to the Chronicler's story of the captivity of Manasseh of Judah, it is safe to say that the events which brought it about must be placed in connection with this same revolt of the western peoples. In addition to these foes on the east and west, the peoples of the north and north-west initiated hostilities and persisted in them. Among others the Mannai and the Cimmerians were smitten by Ashurbanipal. Not until about 640 B.C. was peace restored throughout the Assyrian empire. For twelve years Assyria had been engaged in a desperate struggle for life, which she won, but at terrible cost. Meantime, Egypt, left to her own devices and led by the energetic Psamtik I, had expelled the Ethiopians, made alliance with Gyges of Lydia and so strengthened herself and increased her resources that Ashurbanipal made no further effort to reduce her to submission. The last fourteen years of the reign of Ashurbanipal are shrouded in obscurity.

Since the accession of Manasseh, Judah had been passing through a period of reaction. The ideals exalted by prophets like Isaiah and Micah had suffered eclipse. A relation of vassalage to Assyria had been inherited from Hezekiah's reign. Heavy tribute taxed the resources of the people to the utmost and fretted the freedom-loving spirit of these hill-dwellers almost beyond endurance. It is probable that, when the neighbouring peoples entered into the conspiracy with Shamash-shum-ukin against Ashurbanipal, Judah did not stand aloof. In any case, high hopes were raised by the general revolt throughout the empire only to be dashed to the ground with the collapse of the whole movement. This political maelstrom of dissatisfaction, restlessness, intrigue, hope and despair was intensified by the cross-currents of the social and religious life which ran fast and furious. Foreign customs and practices were welcomed with open arms. Manasseh himself led the reactionary movement in religion which sought to reinstate the old deities and shrines that had been discredited by Sennacherib's invasion. The Baalim and Asherah, so generally worshipped throughout Syria, were restored to favour in Judah. Sun-worship too was officially approved and practised. That all this was due to something more than mere religious indifference, easy-going toleration or even diplomatic acceptance of the cults of the neighbouring peoples allied with Judah in the common desire and purpose to obtain freedom from Assyria, is evident from the fact that Manasseh is said to have offered up one of his own sons as a burnt-offering. This means agonising endeavour on the part of a superstitious and idolatrous people and its king to secure the favour and help of Heaven in their endeavour to better their lot. Despairing of success with the aid of Yahweh alone, they turned eagerly to the other gods of the local pantheon in the hope of securing their co-operation. They were willing to pay the highest price for such aid, withholding not their own heart's blood. The precise significance of the statement in 2 K. 21[16] that "Manasseh shed innocent blood very much, till he had filled Jerusalem from one end to another" is undiscoverable. It may refer to frequent resort to infant sacrifice, though it is unlikely that Manasseh would have been held solely accountable for this; or to a bloody persecution of the prophets of Yahweh (*cf.* Je. 2[30]); or even to acts of tyranny, like the judicial murder of Naboth the Jezreelite in Ahab's time, occasioned by the desire to replenish the royal treasury or to remove influential opposition to the royal policy. The interplay of such conditions and influences produced a high degree of ferment in Jerusalem. With the passing of Manasseh and Amon and the accession of Josiah about 638 B.C., new influences began to come to the fore in Judah. The principles inculcated by the earlier prophets were bearing fruit and were to receive official endorsement when the boy king came to maturity of judgment.

While the new régime was establishing itself in Judah, new forces and strange faces began to appear in the larger arena of western Asia. The Scythians, breaking loose from their mountain fastnesses in the north, came pouring down upon Assyria's territory, sweeping everything before them.* In the extreme west they encountered Psamtik I of Egypt, who had for years been occupied with the siege of Ashdod, which he was now forced to abandon by the advance of the new foe. Crowded back across his own border, there he held the barbarians at bay, whether by force* or by payment of a large amount of gold† is an open question. They seem to have left Jerusalem untouched, both on the way down to Egypt and on the return. But echoes of their march are heard in the prophecies of Jeremiah and Zephaniah, both of whom were called into public life probably by this great invasion. In the eastern half of Assyria's domain, Nineveh was undergoing a siege at the hands of Cyaxares, the Mede, when the Scythians appeared upon the scene. Cyaxares was continuing a struggle between Media and Assyria, the opening stage of which had closed with the defeat and death of Phraortes, his father. The son, again taking the aggressive, had gathered a new army, defeated the Assyrian forces in pitched battle and encamped before the walls of Nineveh itself (625 B.C.). The entrance of the Scythians into Media forced Cyaxares to raise the siege of Nineveh and return to the defence of his own land.‡ There he was defeated and rendered *hors de combat* for nearly twenty years, while the Scythians held his kingdom. This timely relief for Nineveh did but postpone for a little the inevitable downfall of Assyria. The successors of Ashurbanipal, viz., Ashur-etil-ili and Sin-shar-ishkun, were unable to recreate the blood and treasure that had been so lavishly expended by their predecessor on the one hand, and so ruthlessly destroyed by the Scythians on the other. The damage done to the fabric of Assyrian power was irreparable. Weakened as Nineveh was, Babylon under Nabopolassar was able once more to assert her independence and to maintain it.

---

* Hdt., I, 103 *ff*..

The exact course of events immediately preceding the fall of Nineveh is not on record. It can only be conjectured from three varying sources of information, viz., the narrative of Herodotus, the Babylonian tradition received by Berossus and preserved in citations from him by later Greek writers, and the cuneiform records of Babylonia.§ Herodotus relates that Cyaxares, the Mede, treacherously murdered his Scythian masters, drove out their followers from his land and then proceeded once more against Nineveh which now fell into his hands. Berossus tells us that Sin-shar-ishkun (Saracus) heard of the approach of a numerous army from the sea toward Nineveh. Thereupon, he sent his general Busalossorus to check their advance. The latter, however, deserted his king, made alliance with the Medes, giving his son in marriage to the daughter of the Median leader, and then turned against Nineveh. Sin-shar-ishkun then set fire to his own capital and perished in the flames. Still another strand of the tradition of Berossus represents the king of Assyria as having been shut up in his capital for three years by the combined forces of the Medes and the Babylonians. The Tigris then swept away part of the city's walls and the king offered himself and his wives upon the funeral pyre.

---

* *Cf.* Breasted, *History of Egypt*, 581.

† So Hdt., *l. c.*.

‡ Hdt., *l. c.*.

§ The Persian tradition preserved by Ctesias is wholly untrustworthy. The tradition of Berossus was copied by Polyhistor (*c.* 50 B.C.) and transmitted by Abydenus. The latter, however, vitiated the tradition by combining it with the tales of Ctesias in such a way as to render practically futile any attempt to differentiate precisely between the two elements.

The stele of Nabonidus, the last king of Babylon, in relating the overthrow of Assyria says that the king of the Umman-manda came to the help of Babylon and that he laid waste the land of Assyria like a cyclone, ruined the temples of the Assyrian gods and destroyed the cities on the border of Babylonia which had not supported Babylon in the struggle. The vandalism of this ally is said to have grieved the king of Babylon, who had himself refrained from desecrating any of the shrines. The league between the Medes and Babylonians seems to have been brought about by the fact that while Nabopolassar was absent in the north of Mesopotamia attacking the Subaru, the Assyrian king had taken advantage of the opportunity to enter Babylonia and cut off the return of the absent king and his army.* In this dilemma, Nabopolassar called upon the Umman-manda for aid, which they were only too glad to give. Whether or not the Babylonians participated in the siege and capture of Nineveh itself is uncertain; but it is quite clear that the fall of the empire was directly due to the combined efforts of the Babylonians and Medes (with whom the Umman-manda are probably to be identified; at least, the Medes constituted the most influential element in the hordes of the Umman-manda†). The view that Babylon aided in the overthrow of Assyria is corroborated by two Neo-Babylonian letters which seem to refer to the events of this period.* One of them reports to the king concerning a campaign against Assyria which has resulted in victory for Babylon; the other, probably referring to the same campaign, makes it clear that there were two commanders of Babylon's forces and that one of them was a foreigner,—perhaps a general of the Medes.

---

* So Messerschmidt, *Mittheilungen der vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft*, I (1896), 7 *ff*..

† But Rogers, *History of Babylonia and Assyria*, II, 289, identifies the Umman-manda with the Scythians; so also Sayce, Lehmann, *et al*..

Even before life was extinct in the body politic of Assyria, greedy hands were laid upon her estate. Necho II, successor of Psamtik in 609 B.C., set out at once to seize Assyria's possessions in the west. Gaza and Askalon fell before him. On his way to the north he was met by Josiah of Judah, probably at Megiddo (608 B.C.). The inhabitants of Judah, knowing of course that Assyria was powerless and almost certainly doomed, were in a state of exultant confidence in themselves and in Yahweh, their God. He who had at last brought the proud foe and cruel tyrant to ruin was with them and ready to protect them. In this frame of mind, the prospect of replacing Assyria's yoke now broken with one of Egyptian make was not to be tolerated. But the result of the battle with Necho dashed all their hopes to the ground. Necho proceeded on his victorious way as far as the Euphrates, bringing the entire west into subjection to Egypt and upon his return march placing an Egyptian vassal upon the throne of David. With her territory already gone on every side into the hands of Egyptians, Medes and Babylonians, Nineveh herself gave up the hopeless struggle about 606 B.C. and the Assyrian empire fell to rise no more. Two hundred years later, when Xenophon led his band of Greek adventurers past the site of Nineveh (401 B.C.), he found no recollection of the name of the former mistress of the world (*Anabasis*, III, 4, 8–12).†

---

* Published in *Cuneiform Texts on Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum*, XXII, 46 *f*.. *Cf*. Meissner, *OLZ*., IX (1906), 444 *ff*., who first connected them with the fall of Assyria.

† An excellent study of the last half century of Assyrian history is furnished by P. Kleinert, *Nahum und der Fall Nineves, SK*., LXXXIII (1910), 501 *ff*.. *Cf*. also T. Friedrich, *Nineve's Ende und die Ausgänge des assyrischen Reiches*, in *Festgaben zu Ehren Max Büdinger's von seinen Freunden und Schülern* (1898), where a close study of the ruins of Nineveh is made and the conclusion reached that the fall of the city was caused by a flood due to the high waters of the Tigris and its tributary streams. So also Lehmann-Haupt, *Israel: Seine Entwicklung im Rahmen der Weltgeschichte* (1911), p. 149, who testifies to a tradition among the natives that the wall of Nineveh was broken through by the river Khusur.

§ 2. ZEPHANIAH AND HIS TIMES.

1. *The Man.*

The traditions regarding Zephaniah, aside from the superscription of his book, are wholly valueless. His prophecies constitute the only other source of information; and what they furnish is painfully slight. As in the case of so many of the prophets, his personality lies hidden behind his message. He seems to have been an inhabitant of Jerusalem, in view of his familiarity with the topography of his capital ($1^{10 \text{ f.}}$), his knowledge of religious and social conditions within the city and the fact that he identifies it as his own standing-place in 1^4. The apparent claim of the superscription that he was a member of the royal family is supported somewhat by the fact of his familiarity with the manner of life in the princely households and his courage in denouncing the upper classes ($1^{8. \, 9}$ 3^3). Moreover, his complaint is almost wholly against these privileged classes, the rich and the powerful; yet he does not pose as the spokesman of the poor and there is lacking in his utterances that note of sympathy with their sufferings which is so evident in Amos and Micah, a lack easily explained if he himself were a member of the aristocracy and had never felt the pinch of poverty.

Pseudepiphanius (*de vitis prophetarum*, ch. 19) declares him to have been "of the tribe of Simeon from the field (or hill) of Sabaratha (or Baratha)" and to have "died in an apocalypse of the Lord and been buried all alone on his own land." An apocalypse ascribed to Zephaniah is known to have existed by reason of a quotation from it preserved in the *Stromata* (V, 11, § 77) of Clement of Alexandria, viz., "And a spirit took me and carried me into the fifth heaven, and I saw angels, called lords, whose diadem was placed upon them by the Holy Spirit, and the throne of each of them was seven times brighter than the light of the rising sun and they were dwelling in temples of salvation and singing hymns in praise of the inexpressible God, most high." Pseudo-Athanasius refers to the same apocalypse. Two fragments of an apocalypse in Coptic, ascribed to Zephaniah and discovered at Akhmim [published by Bouriant in *Mémoires de la mission archéologique au Caire* (1885); *cf.* Stern, *Zeitschrift für Ægypt. Sprache* (1886)] may also have belonged to it; *v.* Schürer, *Gesch. d. jüd. Volkes*^{3}, III, 271 *f.* According to יחוס אבות, his tomb was in Gibeah of the Lebanons. The traditional representation of him in art shows him carrying a lamp in his left hand; but *cf.* Sargent's Frieze of the Prophets in the Boston Public Library.

Schw. seeks to discount the probability of the ancestor Hezekiah having been the king, which arises from the unusual length of the genealogy, by calling attention to the fact that long genealogies are frequent in the OT. and that their lack in the superscriptions of the prophets may be purely accidental. However, when only one of sixteen prophetic books exhibits a striking variation, the probability seems to lie on the side of that variation having been deliberate rather than accidental. Furthermore, long genealogies are indeed characteristic of priestly writings (Ezr., Ne., 1, 2 Ch.), but are not common in the corresponding prophetic histories (Ju., 1, 2 S., Ki.), being found only in 1 S. 1^{1}.

2. *The Times.*

The date of Zephaniah's prophetic activity, according to the superscription, was in the reign of King Josiah (639–608). Scholars, with one exception,* have accepted this as correct. There is no good reason to suspect the statement; it accords well with the contents of the book, yet it could not easily have been conjectured upon the basis of the book. It is natural to suppose that it rests upon an independent tradition that goes back to fairly early times. The question that may profitably be discussed concerns itself with the particular portion of Josiah's reign to which the prophecy should be assigned. Did Zephaniah do his work before or after the culmination of the great Deuteronomic reform in 621 B.C.?† The answer to this question must be sought in the prophet's own statements as to the conditions prevailing in Judah in his day and in his outlook for the future. His denunciations of syncretism in worship, apostacy from Yahweh, the worship of the heavenly bodies, the aping of foreign customs in religion and in dress (1$^{4-6.\ 8.\ 9}$), and the practical scepticism rebuked in 1^{12} seem to accord perfectly with the state of affairs as it was during the reigns of Manasseh and Amon (2 K. 21$^{2-9.\ 21\ f.}$), and as it may be supposed to have continued during the early portion of Josiah's reign, before he had arrived at an age when he could exercise any powerful influence upon the currents of life and thought in his kingdom. It is unsafe to argue, as Lippl does, that the movement for reform must have begun with Josiah's accession, since the conspirators who slew Amon were supported by the prophets and priests. The motive for the assassination of Amon as a matter of fact is unknown and need have had no connection with his attitude toward religion. The intricacies of the politics of Jerusalem at that time are hidden from us. Opposition on Amon's part to some policy, home or foreign, endorsed by popular sentiment may well have caused "the people of the land" to rise against him. The lad Josiah was an unknown quantity and, perhaps, developed into a totally different kind of ruler from what those who enthroned him had hoped for. In any case, during his early years religious interests probably remained for the most part in the hands of those who had controlled them under Manasseh and Amon.

---

* Viz., Kö.$^{Einl.}$, who places him in the reign of Jehoiakim.

† In favour of the later period may be cited De. (on Habakkuk), Kl., Schw., Schulz and Lippl. But the great majority of scholars is in favour of the earlier period; so, *e. g.*, Hi., We., Or., Dav., GASm., Now., Marti, Beer, Cor., Kennedy (*DB.*).

Effort has been made to account for the conditions reflected by Zephaniah's utterances as indicative of the period of Josiah's reign after 621 B.C. But it seems improbable that such irregularities of cultus could have been openly practised and tolerated in the period immediately after a reform, the main outcome of which was the purification of the cultus. Josiah was a zealous worshipper of Yahweh and no record has reached us of any cooling of his zeal after the reform. Passages from Jeremiah are sometimes cited to show that conditions were as bad in Judah after the reform as they are declared to have been by Zephaniah in his day. Three facts render this argument inconclusive. Jeremiah's early denunciations apparently lay relatively little stress upon the impurity of the cultus which is emphasised by Zephaniah. Many of Jeremiah's prophecies so confidently assigned to the first years after the reform probably belong to his latest work. None of his prophecies were written down until the fourth year of Jehoiakim ($36^{1\text{ f.}}$), and it is practically certain that in the process of transcription they were largely coloured by the prophet's later thought and by the conditions amid which they were written.

Other considerations urged in favour of the post-reformation date fail to make it probable. The phrase "remnant of Baal" (1^4) is said to presuppose the almost complete destruction of Baalism in 621 B.C. But the phrase is equally well translated "Baalism to the last vestige" as in Am. 1^8. *Cf.* אחרית in Am. 4^2 9^1. In like manner, the phrase "sons of the king" (1^8) is under no compulsion to mean the sons of Josiah. In accordance with a very common usage of the word "son" in Hebrew, it may and probably does denote those characterised by the fact of membership in the royal family, viz., uncles and cousins of Josiah and the like. *Cf.* the similar phrase "sons of the prophets." Again, the total silence of Zephaniah as to the king, though denouncing other members of the royal family, is just as easily understood on the basis of the king's youth as it is on the supposition that Josiah's well-known piety after 621 B.C. rendered him immune from all criticism. Nor does the fact that counsel was sought of Huldah, the prophetess, at the time of the discovery of the book of the law force us to conclude that at that time Zephaniah was not yet known as a prophet. The same kind of reasoning would dispose of Jeremiah who had then been in public life for eight years. Zephaniah may have died before 621 B.C., or have been absent from the city at that particular juncture, or not have been in the confidence of the party pushing the reform. Anything which would account satisfactorily for Jeremiah having been ignored would be equally applicable to the case of Zephaniah.

The occasion of Zephaniah's appearance as a prophet seems to have lain in some imminent danger to his nation. He evidently regarded the day of Yahweh as close at hand (1^7). In accordance with the character of earlier prophecy in general and of the day of Yahweh prophecies in particular, it is probable that Zephaniah interpreted the approach of some foreign army as heralding the dawn of Yahweh's day.* The event that best meets the requirements of the situation is the Scythian invasion.† The exact date of the appearance of the Scythians upon the horizon of Palestine cannot be surely fixed. Psamtik I of Egypt began his operations in western Asia in 640 B.C.; and since the Scythians put an effectual stop to his advances in Syria, and Herodotus reports that Psamtik was engaged in the siege of Ashdod for twenty-eight years, it is practically certain that his encounter with the Scythians was nearer 620 than 640 B.C. Cyaxares, the Mede, who became king in 625 B.C., was forced to raise the siege of Nineveh about 620 B.C. by the descent of the Scythians upon his own territory. Somewhere then between 630 and 620 B.C. it is probable that the Scythian raid upon the north and west provinces of the Assyrian empire took place.* The Greek tradition declares the Scythian domination of western Asia to have lasted twenty-eight years. Since their final expulsion was effected somewhere between 599 and 590 B.C.,† this gives 627 B.C. as the earliest date for their appearance in that region. This coincides with the year of Jeremiah's call (Je. 1[2]) and furnishes the necessary external stimulus for the emergence of both Jeremiah and Zephaniah. The widespread activity of the Scythians corresponds with Zephaniah's vision of the coming judgment as extending from Assyria on the north-east to Ethiopia on the south-west. The speed with which the Scythian hordes swept everything before them seems reflected in certain of Zephaniah's utterances (*e. g.*, 1[14] 2[4]). That neither Assyria nor Egypt was thought of by Zephaniah as the agent or forerunner of the coming judgment is clear from the fact that they both are represented as falling victims to it.‡ These being out of the question, the Scythians remain as the most likely candidate for the doubtful honour of world-destroyer. The Babylonians cannot have bulked large in the prophet's mind until shortly before 606 B.C., and other considerations render it unlikely that the prophecy belongs to so late a date (*v. s.*). The fact that neither Assyria nor Egypt was destroyed by the Scythians, but that, on the contrary, Nineveh was temporarily saved by them, only proves that the expectations of the prophet were not fully realised. Ezekiel (38[17]) distinctly implies that certain former prophecies of disaster had not been fulfilled and looks to Gog, of the land of Magog, as destined to bring the final realisation of these predictions. Gog and his hosts, moreover, very closely resemble the Scythians in their character and actions. The reference of Zephaniah to the inability of Jerusalem to ransom herself from the coming foe (1^{18}; *cf.* 1^{11}) is no proof that he knew of the success of Egypt in buying herself free from the Scythians, as Herodotus reports. He may well have arrived at his conclusion on the basis of the reports that reached him of the ruthlessness of these barbarians. Indeed, Herodotus's statement regarding Egypt's escape may not tell the whole story. At any rate, threats similar to that of Zephaniah were made by other prophets who certainly did not have any thought of the Scythians (*e. g.*, Is. 13^{17} Ez. 7^{19}; *cf.* Je. 4^{5}).

---

* *V.* JMPS., *The Day of Yahweh*, *AJTh.*, V (1901), 505 *ff.*; *cf.* Gressmann, *Der Ursprung d. isr.-jüd. Eschatologie* (1905), 142 *ff.*.

† This connection was first suggested by C. F. Cramer, *Scythische Denkmäler in Palästina* (1778); it is now the prevailing view.

---

* *V.* J. V. Prášek, *Gesch. der Meder u. Perser*, I (1906), 141 *ff*.. Hdt., indeed, makes the march against Egypt *follow* the attack upon the Medes; but it seems difficult to reconstruct the history on that basis.

† Prášek, *op. cit.*, 152.

‡ Schw., in spite of this, seeks to identify the expected destroyer with Egypt. This would be possible only by eliminating 1[12] or by discriminating sharply between Ethiopia and Egypt as Zephaniah probably did not do.

On the whole, therefore, it seems probable that Zephaniah prophesied on the verge of the Scythian invasion of Syria. It is not necessary to suppose that he conceived of them as exhausting the divine anger in their chastisement of the nations. They seem rather to have been thought of as furnishing the prelude to the great drama of destruction. Human and divine forces were to co-operate in this as in other judgment scenes depicted by the prophets (*e. g.*, Am. 5^{14} $8^{8.\ 9}$). In the approach of the Scythians, Zephaniah saw signs of the breaking up of the existing world-powers and hastened to proclaim it as the great judgment day of Yahweh, the God of Israel and the God of justice.

§ 3. THE BOOK OF ZEPHANIAH.

1. *The Contents.*

The thought of the book is centred upon one great theme, the coming of the day of Yahweh. As the book now stands, this theme is presented under four successive phases. Ch. 1 sets forth the first of these, viz., the announcement of the near approach of the great day with its overwhelming terrors which are to involve the world in general and Judah in particular. The prophet's primary interest naturally is in the fate of his own people; hence his message is addressed to them. Ch. 2, the second phase of the subject, announces the coming of this same great day upon the neighbouring peoples, viz., the Philistines, Moabites, Ammonites, Ethiopians or Egyptians, and Assyrians. In the third division, ch. 3^{1-7}, the prophet returns to his own people and contrasts their sinfulness with the righteousness of Yahweh. In this contrast lies the cause of the disaster coming upon Jerusalem. In the fourth and final stage of the presentation, ch. 3^{8-20}, the thought leaps forward to the future, and declares that after the process of the purification of the people of Yahweh is completed, the nation will enjoy world-wide fame as the redeemed of Yahweh, the mighty God.

2. *Later Additions.*

Critical study of the contents of the book during the last half century has resulted in the setting apart of certain portions of the text as belonging neither to Zephaniah nor to his times, but as due to accretion in later days. A presentation of the considerations which have produced this change of opinion may be found in the following commentary in connection with the various passages involved. Here we may present only a sketch of the history of this critical movement and a summary of the conclusions reached in this commentary.

The process of criticism began with Eichhorn (1824), *Einl.*^{4}, and Theiner (1828), who decided against 2^{13-15} as alien to the thought of Zephaniah. Forty years later, Oort, in *Godgeleerde Bijdragen* for 1865, pp. 812 *ff.*, set aside 2^{7-11} and 3^{14-20} as secondary matter. His view of the latter passage has now won general recognition. Sta.^{GVI} (1887), 644, followed by denying the whole of ch. 3 to Zephaniah and questioning $2^{1-3.\ 11}$. Kue., *Onderzoek* (1889), responded by denying the force of the arguments against all but 3^{14-20}. In 1890, Schw. made an elaborate investigation of chs. 2 and 3, coming to the conclusion that Zephaniah wrote only 2^{13-15} and possibly 2^{1-4}, while an exilic hand contributed 2^{5-12} and a postexilic, 3^{1-20}. We. endorsed the views of Sta. and Schw. on ch. 3, athetized also 2^{8-11} and expressed doubt as to $2^{2.\ 3}$. Bu. (*SK.*, 1893, pp. 393 *ff.*; so also in *Gesch.*, 1906) separated 2^{4-15} $3^{9.\ 10.\ 14-20}$ from the genuine material. Dav. made a careful examination of the arguments of all his predecessors and was content to give Zephaniah credit for all except $3^{10.\ 14-20}$. Now. eliminated only $2^{3.\ 7a.c.\ 8-11}$

3^{14-20} (similarly also Baudissin, *Einl.*, 553 *ff.* and Selbie, art. *Zephaniah*, *DB.*). GASm. accepted Bu.'s view of ch. 3, but dissented as to ch. 2, regarding all but 2^{8-11} as genuine. Dr. [*EB.*, IV (1903), 5406 *f.*; so also in his commentary (1906); in *Intr.* (1910) he adds 3^{18-20} to the passages that are "very probably later additions"], with customary caution, conceded the probability of the late origin of $2^{7b.\ 11}$ $3^{9.\ 10}$ and refused to decide as to 3^{14-20}, the latter part of which, viz., 3^{18-20}, he considered "more open to suspicion than 3^{14-17}." Marti, with enviable certainty as to the exact dates of the various additions, agreed with Sta. in taking away from Zephaniah the whole of ch. 3, but in ch. 2 deprived him only of $2^{3.\ 8-11.\ 15}$, aside from numerous glosses. Cor. accepted the view of Now. for the most part, setting aside $2^{7a.\ c.\ 8-11}$ 3^{14-20}. Van H., a scholarly Catholic, contended for the unity of the book as the product of Zephaniah's preaching, with the exception of a few glosses (*e. g.*, $2^{7-10.\ 11}$). In the same year (1908), Beer gave essential adherence to Sta.'s position, rejecting $2^{7a-10.\ 15}$, with the whole of ch. 3, and questioning 2^{1-3}. The conclusions of Fag. are practically the same. Lippl, with Catholic caution and sound learning, concedes the later origin of only $2^{7a.\ c.\ 14b}$ $3^{19.\ 20}$, though granting a reasonable doubt as to the originality of 2^{8-11} in its present form. Du., the most recent writer, follows closely after We., dropping $2^{3a.\ b.\ 6b.\ c.\ 8-11.\ 15}$ and the whole of ch. 3.

In this commentary, the following materials, in addition to minor glosses, are treated as of secondary origin. The oracle against Moab and Ammon ($2^{8.\ 9}$) is relegated to later times since its phraseology presupposes the conditions of the exile as actually existing. An expansion of this oracle is found in $2^{10.\ 11}$. The fall of Nineveh is taken for granted in 2^{15}, which is therefore placed after that event. In the third chapter the only original matter is found in vv. $^{1-5}$. Vv. $^{6.\ 7}$ may possibly be old material; but in that case they are out of place in their present context. Vv. $^{8-13}$ are a postexilic addition, in which is now included a gloss (vv. $^{9-10}$) revealing a different attitude toward the heathen and interrupting the continuity of thought between vv. ^{8} and ^{11}. Vv. $^{14-20}$ are another addition from postexilic times, which has likewise undergone some inner expansion.

The allowance of time necessary for the various additions to the book, together with the still later glosses upon those additions, necessitates placing the completion of the prophecy in its present form well along in the postexilic period. The final touches may have been given as late as the Greek period. The history of the growth of OT. books shows that they were all subject to this kind of treatment, at least until they were recognised as canonical. Indeed, it is by no means certain that canonicity in its early stages guaranteed immunity from such modifications. The Book of the Twelve was, in all probability, the last candidate to secure admission to the prophetic canon.

3. *Poetic Form.*

The honour of having been the first to announce the discovery of a special poetic metre in the book of Zephaniah belongs to Budde,* who declared that 2^{4-15} and 3^{1-13} were written in the dirge-rhythm, *i. e.*, in lines of 3+2 beats each.

In 1886, Dr. C. A. Briggs (*Messianic Prophecy*, 221–225) had printed a translation of Zp. $1^{2.\ 3.\ 14-18}$ 2^{1-3} 3^{8-20} arranged in poetic lines, but without special consideration of the question of poetic form. The next scholar to discuss the question was D. H. Müller (*Die Propheten in ihrer ursprünglichen Form*, 1896), who hailed this book as the first prophecy to which it had been possible to apply his scheme of strophic analysis throughout. Treating the book as a unit, with the exception of 3^{14-20}, and laying undue emphasis upon incidental resemblances, he wrought out a system of "inclusion," "concatenation" and "responsion" (*V.* H.^{AH}, clxv), yielding seven strs. in ch. 1, with 5+7+7+7+6+6+6 lines each respectively. Ch. 2 fell into five strs. having 7+7+8+8+4 lines, and ch. 3 yielded seven more strs. having 7+7+7+7+3+7+7 lines each respectively. An example of the artificial character of this scheme is furnished in the fact that 2^{11} is separated from 2^{10} and with 1^{13-14} is organised into an eight-line str. GASm., without any attempt at strophic reorganisation, followed Bu. in printing $2^{4-7.\ 13-15}$ as poetry written in elegiac rhythm. Marti was the first to attempt to restore in the various oracles both the metrical and the strophic uniformity which he supposed to have belonged to them originally. The genuine material in chs. 1 and 2 he organised into strs. of four lines each, in trimeter movement (or two lines each in double trimeter). In ch. 3 he discovered three different poetic forms, viz., 3^{1-7} = strs. of six lines each in dimeter; 3^{8-13} = strs. of four *qina*-lines each; and 3^{14-20} = strs. of four lines each in interchanging trimeter and dimeter. Hal., disregarding both metre and str., indicated his recognition of the material as poetry by printing it according to the parallelism. Siev. thus far has made the most serious attempt to reduce the text to rigidly poetical forms. But the result is by no means self-authenticating. Ch. 1, for example, is presented in two sections; the first is composed of vv. $^{2-6.\ 8-13.\ 17}$ and is organised into seven strs. of two heptameter lines each; while the second is composed of vv. $^{7.\ 14-16}$ and comprises four strs., each of two lines, one heptameter and one tetrameter. But in the first section, Str. I breaks down metrically; Str. IV transposes materials as follows, vv. $^{8b.\ 9b.\ 8c.\ 9a}$; and Str. VII brings together vv. ^{13a} and ^{17}; while in the second section, Str. IV lacks the requisite tetrameter line. Again, 3^{1-7} is presented in five strs. of two lines each, one of eight beats and one of four. But to make this possible, a total of eighteen words is omitted at six different points and most of them for no reason but that of metrical necessity. This is too high a price for so slight a boon. Cor. satisfies himself with stating that the genuine materials in Zephaniah may all be reduced to strs. of twelve lines each (*i. e.*, six double lines). Strophic uniformity of this kind can be secured only by rejecting as ungenuine all that does not readily conform to this strophic norm. Fag. offers a strophical reconstruction of the book which differs only in slight details from that of Marti. Lippl attempts no strophic structure, but prints in lines based upon the parallelism and points out the numerous changes necessary to reduce the various lines to uniformity even within the separate sections of the prophecy. Du. finds strs. of four lines each all through the book, except in the case of a few glosses and additions, and applies the *qina*-rhythm throughout.

---

* *SK.* (1893); *cf. Gesch.* (1906).

In this commentary, effort is made not to lay undue emphasis upon considerations arising from the poetic form. The science of Hebrew metre is as yet in an inchoate state, notwithstanding the praiseworthy and painstaking studies of Sievers, Rothstein, *et al.*. Consequently, conclusions as to the integrity of a text which are based solely or primarily upon metrical considerations are inevitably open to grave suspicion. The parallelism has been followed here as the only safe guide to the length of lines and the logical grouping of the thought as the primary consideration in the formation of strs..* For a statement of the views here controlling in reference to metre and str., reference may be had to H.^{AH}, clxvi *ff.*. Attention may be called to a slight variation in usage here, whereby the distich, rather than the single stichos or line, is made the basal unit of the str.. This seems required by the fact that the thought is completely presented only in the distich and that in some cases there is no clearly marked cæsura within the distich (*e. g.*, Mi.

---

* *Cf.* Intr. to Comm. on Micah, § 1.

7^{8b} Zp. 1^{4b} $2^{9a.\ 14b}$ 3^{7c}). It may be noted also, that while there can be no doubt that the number of poetic feet in a stichos was determined by the number of tone-phrases,* and that as a rule the same number of feet per stichos or distich prevailed throughout a poem, yet cases are plentiful in which changes of measure occur within a poem (*e. g.*, Zp. 1^{7-18} 2^{1-7} 3^{1-5}). To reduce these variations to metrical uniformity involves such arbitrariness in textual criticism as to discredit the whole process. A large degree of freedom in the use of poetical forms seems to have been exercised by the prophetic poets.

The book of Zephaniah, as here analysed, consists of eight poetic oracles of varying length. It is scarcely probable that these represent the entire literary output of this prophet. Nor is it likely that any of the eight constituted a complete sermon; they are rather selections from a larger body of materials. The metres used are three, viz., hexameter (3 : 3), *qina* (3 : 2) and tetrameter (2 : 2). Of these, the *qina* is the most commonly used; for an announcement of chastisement and affliction, it is the most suitable measure. The length of the strs. varies from two distichs to eight; but, with two somewhat uncertain exceptions (3^{1-5} and 3^{14-20}), the strophic unit within a poem is constant.

Zephaniah can hardly be considered great as a poet. He does not rank with Isaiah, nor even with Hosea in this particular. He has no great imaginative powers; no deep insight into the human heart is reflected in his utterances; nor any keen sensitiveness to the beauties of nature. His harp is not attuned to the finer harmonies of life like that of Jeremiah. He had an imperative message to deliver and proceeded in the most direct and forceful way to discharge his responsibility. What he lacked in grace and charm, he in some measure atoned for by the vigour and clarity of his speech. He realised the approaching terror so keenly that he was able to present it vividly and convincingly to his hearers. No prophet has made the picture of the day of Yahweh more real.

---

* *Cf.* H.$^{\text{AH}}$, *l. c.*.

§ 4. THE MESSAGE OF ZEPHANIAH.

Zephaniah spoke at a time when wise and courageous leadership was needed in Judah. Whatever enthusiasm and loyalty to Yahweh had been aroused by the preaching of Isaiah and by the deliverance of Jerusalem from Sennacherib in 701 B.C. had died out during the long period of distress and humiliation under Manasseh. Lacking the incentive of a great devotion to Yahweh, the people had fallen away into all kinds of idolatry and corruption. Nowhere is the religious and moral situation of the times more clearly portrayed than in Zephaniah's prophecies. He directs his blows against a syncretism in religion that does not hesitate to couple the worship of the Baalim, of Milcom and the host of heaven, with that of Yahewh (1[4. 5]). In Zephaniah's eyes, such conduct is tantamount to apostacy from Yahweh (1[6]). Indeed, he charges certain leaders with a kind of practical scepticism, or atheism; they count upon the inertia of Yahweh, alleging that he does nothing, neither good nor bad; they therefore proceed to the furthest lengths of wickedness. This indifference to religion and its claims on the part of those who were "settled on their lees" was accompanied, as in all similar cases, by a corresponding materialism which had no sense of justice. Hence Zephaniah denounces the prevalent violence and trickery, the tyranny of the rulers, the perversion of justice by the judges themselves, the prostitution of religion to base ends by the priests and prophets and the aping of foreign styles by the rich (1[8. 9] 3[1-4]).

The religious indifference and eclecticism on the one hand, and the materialistic selfishness and injustice on the other, were a natural reaction from the exalted ideas and ideals of the previous generation. The expectations and high hopes of Isaiah and his contemporaries had failed to materialise. Yahweh's people was still under the heel of the oppressor. The yoke of Assyria was as heavy and as galling as ever. In despair of deliverance through Yahweh, his followers were seeking to supplement his weakness by having recourse to other gods in conjunction with him, or were abandoning him altogether. The naïve faith of that earlier time was outgrown. Its driving power was gone. A new interpretation of history was the need of the hour. New conceptions and ideals must be substituted for those outworn.

Zephaniah was not the man to supply this need. He had no new ideals. He furnished no new constructive principles. He saw no further into the meaning of current events than his predecessors. He was content to apply the interpretations that had long rendered good service in the hands of the prophets. His preaching was not positive and constructive in tone, but wholly negative and destructive. Denunciation and threatening constitute his message.

As Amos and Hosea were called out by the approach of danger from the north, so it is probable that Zephaniah and Jeremiah were aroused by the imminence of the Scythian invasion. As earlier prophets had seen in the Assyrian army the herald of the day of Yahweh, so Zephaniah interpreted the approach of the Scythian hordes; this was the one great absorbing theme of his prophecy. Again, like Amos, he saw the day of Yahweh as fraught with destruction, as near at hand and as coming not only upon other nations, viz., Philistia, Egypt and Assyria, but also, and pre-eminently, upon Yahweh's own nation ($1^{4\text{ ff. }7.\ 14}$ $2^{4\text{ ff. }12\text{ ff.}}$). Unlike Jeremiah, his contemporary, who uttered warnings of coming catastrophe while his heart was breaking, Zephaniah betrays no sympathy, compassion or emotion of any kind over the impending fate of his people. He speaks almost as a disinterested spectator.

The purpose of the approaching judgment as understood by Zephaniah was moral. It was a condemnation of sin and an expression of the ethical righteousness of Yahweh. Yet this ethical motive finds expression only in the announcement of the judgment upon Judah; it plays no part in the threats against the nations. In these latter utterances, the old narrow particularism seems to find free course. The nations are overthrown as enemies of Israel and Israel's God. Out of the general catastrophe, a remnant of Israel will survive to worship Yahweh in undisturbed serenity. The spirit which will characterise this group, as noted by a later hand, will be one of humility, meekness, straightforwardness, trust in Yahweh and genuine piety ($3^{11.\,12}$). It is the type of religion enjoined in Mi. 6^{6-8}.

In only one particular has Zephaniah ever been credited with originality. Until within recent years he has been generally acknowledged as the first of the prophets to announce the coming of a universal judgment. It is doubtful, however, whether this claim for him can now stand.* For a prophet who displays no capacity for constructive thought elsewhere, so great an advance step as this seems unlikely. The feature of the day of Yahweh which holds the foremost place in his thought is evidently a war (1^{16-18} 2^{12}), presumably the Scythian invasion, not a world-wide catastrophe. The latter is only the dark background against which the concrete impending disaster is shown in lurid colours. The catastrophic, cataclysmic subversion of the physical universe seems rather to be a part of the eschatology of the times to which he fell heir. This phase of the judgment has no definite aim; it is totally lacking in moral discrimination; it exhibits a certain inconsistency of presentation (*e. g.*, 1^7; *cf.* 1^2); and it is without any definite warrant, no reason being offered for its coming. It bears the marks of its origin in the misty realm of myth; and myths do not arise in the clear light of history. The conception of a world-destroying judgment belongs in the same category with the story of the Deluge. Like the latter, its origin probably dates back to prehistoric days. Zephaniah, like his predecessors (*e. g.*, Am. $1^{2\,(?)}$ 5^{18-20} 7^{4-6} Ho. 4^3 Mi. $1^{3\,\text{f.}}$ Is. $2^{10\,\text{ff.}}$), does but endeavour to adjust the old conceptions to the new conditions created by the approach of the Scythians. The essential sanity and clear vision of Zephaniah and his predecessors is evinced in the fact that they lay their emphasis not upon the old, unethical and cataclysmic features of the current eschatology, but rather upon the definite historical forces of their own time, which are interpreted by them as great ethical agencies for the purificatory chastisement of Israel at the hand of Yahweh.

The conception of a day of universal judgment does not in and of itself demonstrate a monotheistic idea of God. The Deluge myth in Babylonia arose in the midst of a crass polytheism; and the story found a hospitable reception in Israel long before monotheism was developed. Nor does Zephaniah's attack upon the syncretism in the religion of his day ($1^{4\,ff.}$) guarantee his monotheism; this attitude of mind had long been characteristic of the prophets, who had always insisted upon exclusive loyalty to Yahweh as over against foreign deities. Yet these views are not at all inconsistent with a view of Yahweh as the Lord of lords and the only God. That such was Zephaniah's view is rendered probable by the emphasis he lays upon the ethical requirements of Yahweh, for it was by this route that Israel arrived at monotheism. This probability is reinforced by the fact that the religious writings of his contemporaries, *e. g.*, Jeremiah and Deuteronomy, reflect a monotheistic theology. It may be, indeed, that Zephaniah himself was one of the group who wrought out the Deuteronomic Code and aided in the promulgation of the reform. Whether or not he was directly engaged in this enterprise we have no means of knowing; but it may be readily granted that his preaching had much to do with preparing the minds and hearts of the people and the court for the reformation.

---

* *Cf.* Gunk., *Zum religionsgesch. Verständnis des N. T.* (1903), 21 *ff.*, Gressmann, *Eschatologie* (1905), 144 *ff.*.

§ 5. LITERATURE ON THE BOOK OF ZEPHANIAH.

1. *Commentaries.*

The more important commentaries of recent times are: Ewald (1867), Reinke (1868), Hitzig-Steiner (1881), Orelli (1888; 3d ed., 1908), Wellhausen (1892; 3d ed., 1898), Davidson (1896), Nowack (1897; 2d. ed., 1903), G. A. Smith (1898), Marti (1903), Halévy (1905), Driver (1906), van Hoonacker (1908), Rothstein (in Kau., 1909), and Lippl (1910).

2. *On Introduction.*

The chief writings on isagogic problems are cited in § 3^2. Special attention may be directed here to the studies of Stade, Schwally, Budde, van Hoonacker and Lippl. Useful summaries will be found in the well-known "Introductions" of Driver, Cornill, König, Kuenen and Wildeboer; in the Dictionary articles by Selbie (*DB.*), W. R. Smith and Driver (*EB.*), and Beer (*PRE.*³); and in E. Besson, *Introduction au Prophète Sophonie* (1910).

Discussions of the poetic form and character of the book are listed in § 3³.

3. *The Teaching.*

In addition to the sections in the commentaries and "Introductions" setting forth the thought and teaching of Zephaniah, expositions of this subject that are worthy of mention will be found in Duhm, *Die Theologie der Propheten* (1875), 222–25; Kuenen, *The Prophets and Prophecy in Israel* (1875), 171 *f.*; Orelli, *Old Testament Prophecy* (1885), § 34; Marti, *Geschichte der israelitischen Religion*³ (1897), 184; Smend, *Lehrbuch der alttestamentlichen Religionsgeschichte*² (1899), 243 *f.*; R. H. Charles, *A Critical History of the Doctrine of the Future Life in Israel, in Judaism and in Christianity* (1899), 97–99; Stade, *Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments* (1905), 250 *f.*; Gressmann, *Der Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie* (1905), 141; Köberle, *Sünde und Gnade* (1905), 195 *f.*; Staerk, *Das Assyrische Weltreich im Urteil der Propheten* (1908), 165–170; Cheyne, *The Two Religions of Israel* (1911), 44–46.

A COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF ZEPHANIAH.

§ 1. THE SUPERSCRIPTION (1^1).

This introduces the author, traces his lineage, declares the source and authority of his message and states the period of his public activity.

> The statements of the superscription are supported by the contents of the book at least so far as any evidence is forthcoming. Yet in view of the slight stress laid upon authorship in early Hebrew literature, much of it being anonymous, and in the light of the superscriptions to the remaining prophetic books, the majority of their titles being certainly of late origin, the probability is that this one is likewise from the hand of an editor (*contra* Hi.). There is no basis, however, for Marti's supposition that the chronological clause is of later origin than the remainder.

1. *The word of Yahweh*] *V.* H.$^{\text{AH, 201 f.}}$.—*Which came unto*] *V.* on Mi. 1^1.—*Zephaniah*] Nothing is known of him except what is to be learned from his book (*v.* Intr., § 1).—*The son of Çushi, the son of Gedaliah, the son of Amariah, the son of Hezekiah*] This is the most extended of the prophetic genealogies. Eight of the prophets are left without any family history;* the fathers of six others are named;† while Zechariah's father and grandfather are both recorded; but Zephaniah is traced two generations still further back. This variation is certainly not without reason and the most natural explanation is that offered by the view that the Hezekiah here listed was the king by that name.‡ This probability is supported by the fact that the name Hezekiah is not borne

---

* Viz., Dn., Am., Ob., Mi., Na., Hb., Hg., Mal..

† Viz., Is., Je., Ez., Ho., Jon., Jo..

‡ So, *e. g.*, AE., Hi., We., Schw., Dav., Now., GASm., Marti; *contra* Abar., De., Cor., Or. *et al.*.

by any other pre-exilic person on record and that all the names of the genealogy, save Cushi, are formed with the affix "yah" which formation seems to have been specially common in the royal family.* The only two objections to this view are (1) that Hezekiah is not here designated as king and (2) that the genealogy cites three generations between Hezekiah and Zephaniah, whereas between Hezekiah, the king, and Josiah in whose reign Zephaniah prophesied there are only two. In reply to the first objection, it is sufficient to say that at the time the superscription was attached it is probable that it was taken for granted that it would be understood as indicating the king, and the word 'king' was not added since its presence would have occasioned an unpleasant repetition. As to the second, it will be remembered that the reigns of Manasseh and Amon extended through fifty-seven years and that Manasseh was forty-five years old when Amon was born (2 K. $21^{1.\ 19}$). If Amariah was of adult age, or nearly so, when Manasseh began his long reign† and if we allow a lapse of twenty years between the birth of each father and that of his first son, Zephaniah may easily have been from fifteen to twenty years old when Josiah ascended the throne and thus of mature age when he began his ministry. Unfortunately, the exact date of Hezekiah's death is uncertain, and consequently the birth-year of Manasseh cannot be determined with precision; but the period between the birth of Amariah and that of his great-grandson may be reduced to not more than forty-eight years, and the genealogy will still be not improbable. For Jehoiachin, king of Judah, was born when his great-grandfather Josiah was but forty-eight years old (2 K. 21^{19} 22^{1} $23^{30\text{ f. } 34\text{-}36}$).‡ Zephaniah's royal ancestry is rendered probable also by his apparent familiarity with the conditions at court in his own day. *Cf.* Intr., § 2^1.—*In the days of Josiah, son of Amon, king of Judah*] The designation as "king of Judah," rather than as simply "the king," is insufficient reason for making this portion of the superscription of later origin than the rest; for oriental kings were not infrequently so designated by their contemporaries and even by themselves.* The accuracy of this date for the activity of Zephaniah is not open to legitimate doubt (*v.* Intr., § 2). Yet it is going too far to say that since no editor could have derived his information from the book itself the chronological statement must be correct.† The probability of its truth would seem to be even greater indeed if there were clear and unmistakable indications in the following prophecy of the period to which it belonged.

---

* *V.* G. B. Gray, *Studies in Hebrew Proper Names*, 262.

† Manasseh was not necessarily older than Amariah, since the succession did not always fall to the eldest son, especially in polygamous families.

‡ *V.* G. B. Gray, *Exp.*, July, 1900, pp. 76–80.

1. צפניה], *i. e.*, 'י *is protector.* It occurs also as the name of a priest in Je. 21^{1} 29$^{25.\ 29}$ 52^{24} and in the fuller form צפניהו in 2 K. 25^{18} Je. 37^{3}; as designating a returned exile in Zc. 6$^{10.\ 14}$, and a Levite in 1 Ch. 6^{21}. The Elephantine papyri (C 20, D 32) furnish still another צפניה; and a Hebrew gem in the British Museum (No. 1032) carries the legend לשחרחר בן צפניהו. The same root occurs as the second part of a proper name in אליצפן (Nu. 34^{25}) with its variant אלצפן (Ex. 6^{22} Lv. 10^{14}); 𝔊 in all three places has Ελισαφαν. Similar formations occur in Carthaginian inscriptions; *e. g.*, צפנבעל in *CIS.*, Nos. 207, 371, 415, as the name of a woman; and in Assyrian; *e. g.*, Baal-ṣa-pû-nu, Gîr-ṣa-pû-nu, Giri-ṣa-puni, Ba'li-ṣapûna, Ba'il-ṣapûna and Ṣapûna, all of them apparently west-Semitic names (*KAT.*^{3}, 479). The place-names בעל צפון (Ex. 14^{2}) and צפון (Jos. 13^{27} Ju. 12$^{1(?)}$); the personal names צפון (Nu. 26^{15}), צפיון (Gn. 46^{16}); and especially the Phœnician עבד צפון (*CIS.*, 265; Euting, 192), and בר צפן (*CIS.*, 208), and the divine name on the so-called Job-stone, found east of the Sea of Galilee, which is probably to be read ארכנאצפן (*v.* Erman, *Zeitschrift für Ægypt. Sprache*, XXXI, 100 *f.*) make it probable that צפן was originally the name of a Semitic god whom the Hebrews ultimately came to identify with Yahweh exactly as they had treated the Baalim (*e. g.*, בעליה, 1 Ch. 12^{5}; *cf.* Ho. 2^{18}) and as the Babylonians of later times treated their various deities whom they came to consider as but partial manifestations of the supreme god, Marduk (Pinches, *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute*, XXVIII, 8 *f.*; *cf.* Zimmern, *KAT.*^{3}, 609; Baethgen, *Beiträge z. sem. Religionsgeschichte*, 22; H. P. Smith, *AJSL.*, XXIV, 56).—כושי] Elsewhere a gentilic, except probably in Je. 36^{14}; it also occurs, as Schw. has noted, in an ins. from Ipsambul (*CIS.*, No. 112) as a man's name, כשי.—אמריה] This son of Hezekiah is otherwise unknown. The most plausible view of 2 K. 20^{18} makes it a late expansion, referring to "sons" in the looser sense of "descendants," the words אשר הוליד being a gloss. In any case, the captivity of the royal family there mentioned is only a partial one, and, on the hypothesis of the literal accuracy of the narrative as it stands, we may either suppose that Amariah escaped entirely or that it did not occur until after the birth of his son Gedaliah.—חִזְקִיָּה] 𝔖 = חִלְקִיָּה; so Kenn. 178, 155, 201, 224, 225, and de R. 341, 346. *Cf.* an Arm. ms. cited by HP. as reading *υιου Γοδολιου χελκεου*.—אמון] 𝔊^{A} 𝔄 and Kenn. 258 = אמוץ.

---

* *Cf.*, *e. g.*, the opening lines of the inscription of Nebuchadrezzar I, who is there entitled "King of Babylon"; so also in the inscription of Ashurnaçirpal from the temple of Balawat, the monolith of Shalmaneser II, the Nimrud inscription of Tiglath-pileser III, the cylinder inscription of Sargon, the Taylor cylinder of Sennacherib and several inscriptions of Esarhaddon, Ashurbanipal and Nebuchadrezzar II.

† *Contra* Cor..

§ 2. THE DAY OF DOOM UPON JUDAH AND JERUSALEM (1$^{2-6}$).

A single str. of eight lines announcing with prophetic finality the approaching day of judgment upon the world in general and Judah in particular.

I WILL utterly sweep away all from upon the face of the ground; it is the oracle of Yahweh.
I will sweep away man and beast; I will sweep away the fowl of the heavens and the fish of the sea;
And I will stretch out my hand against Judah, and against all the inhabitants of Jerusalem;
And from this place I will cut off Baal to the last remnant, and the name of the idol-priests;
And those prostrating themselves upon the roofs to the host of the heavens;
And those prostrating themselves before Yahweh, who swear by Milcom;
And those who withdraw from following Yahweh;
Even those who have not sought Yahweh, nor inquired of him.

This str. stands at the head of Zephaniah's prophecies, announcing the general theme of them all. It has suffered somewhat at the hands of editors, but the additions are easily recognisable.—**2.** *I will utterly sweep away all from upon the face of the ground*] A day of doom for the entire world. The judgment is wholly undiscriminating and all-comprehensive. For a similar approach by way of the universal toward the particular, *cf.* Mi. 1$^{2\,\mathrm{ff.}}$ Am. 1$^{2-4}$.—*It is the oracle of Yahweh*] The most solemn form of announcement (*v.* H.$^{\mathrm{AH},\,59}$). Metrical considerations are insufficient warrant for the omission of these words as a gloss.*—**3.** *I will sweep away man and beast; I will sweep away the fowl of the heav-*

---

* *Contra* Marti, Siev., Fag..

ens and the fish of the sea] For similarly all-inclusive pictures of destruction, *cf.* Ho. 4^{3} Is. 2^{12-21} Ez. 38^{19}. The fish escaped in the Noachian deluge (Gn. 7^{21-23}). Universal depravity demands universal destruction. The subordinate creatures share the fate of man, their ruler.—*And I will cause the wicked to stumble*] This is a gloss* from some reader who felt the injustice of an indiscriminate punishment. 𝔐 can be rendered only, "and the ruins with the wicked," which, as von Orelli notes, seems to be suggestive of an earthquake as constituting the disaster. The rendering of RV., "stumbling-blocks," involves a change of text (*v. i.*) and fails to improve the sense. In any case, any kind of allusion to "the wicked" at this point is premature.—*And I will cut off mankind from upon the face of the ground; it is the oracle of Yahweh*] This is a gloss,† which adds nothing to what has already been said in vv. $^{2.\ 3a}$. Some seek to save this line for Zephaniah by reading "the wicked"‡ or "the men of wickedness"§ with 𝔊. But the reading of 𝔊 is more easily explained as due either to free translation or to an inner Greek corruption than as representing the original text from which 𝔐 has been derived.—**4.** *And I will stretch out my hand against Judah and against all the inhabitants of Jerusalem*] The real object of the prophet's interest and Yahweh's wrath now emerges. The world-judgment forms only the stage-setting for the tragedy of Judah's affliction. For the figure of Yahweh's hand uplifted for punishment, *cf.* Is. $9^{12.\ 17.\ 21}$ 10^{5} 5^{25} $14^{26.\ 27}$. The emphasis laid upon the wickedness of Jerusalem by Zephaniah is only slightly less than is the case with Micah. For both prophets alike, the capital city is the head and front of Judah's offending. The difference between the two is that for Micah the outstanding crimes of Judah were in the ethical and social sphere, while for Zephaniah they fall within the narrower sphere of religion proper.—*And from this place I will cut off Baal to the last remnant*] The more familiar translation here is "the remnant of Baal," which would imply that Baalism had been reduced to small proportions by the time of Zephaniah. Such a diminution of its influence would seem to require that Zephaniah's work be placed after the reform of 621 B.C.* But this date is less probable than an earlier period on other grounds (*v.* Intr., § 2). The rendering here chosen avoids that necessity and is supported by usage elsewhere; *cf.* Am. 4^2 Is. 14^{22} 17^3.† The prophet simply announces the total extermination of Baalism as close at hand. The Chronicler does indeed place the beginning of Josiah's reform activities very early in his reign (2 Ch. 34^{3-7}), but the historicity of that narrative is open to serious question. Baalism died hard in Israel. Yahweh never had the sole and undivided allegiance of Israel in the pre-exilic age.‡ Notwithstanding the bitter opposition to Baalism on the part of Elijah, Hosea and all the succeeding prophets, it still called for the prophetic wrath of Zephaniah. Nor is it necessarily a diluted form of Baalism with which we have here to do, a Baalism cloaking itself under the guise of Yahwism, a syncretism wherein the outer shell of Yahwism was filled with the inner spirit of Baalism. It was rather an unadulterated Baalism which Zephaniah denounced. The out and out idolatry named in the following verse points in this direction. So does the testimony regarding the idolatrous reaction under Manasseh and Amon (2 K. 21), which continued without serious check until the time of the Deuteronomic reform. The phrase "from this place" is treated by some as a gloss;§ but the metrical basis upon which this is urged is not sufficiently strong. The place meant is Jerusalem which is thus designated as the headquarters of Baal and all his works. Zephaniah was at least in the city when he used this phrase even if his home were not there.—*And the name of the idol-priests*] A designation for idolatrous priests found only here and Ho. 4^4 10^5 2 K. 23^5; *cf.* H.$^{\text{AH, 346 f.}}$. Name and personality were so intimately connected in Semitic thought that to destroy the former was to destroy the latter also. This expression is not infrequently used to indicate a most complete and thoroughgoing destruction.—*With the priests*] A gloss** intended to supplement or explain the rare word "idol-priests." The best witnesses to 𝔊 omit this phrase (*v. i.*); it adds nothing essential and is superfluous metrically.

---

* So We., Dav., Now., Marti, Siev., Dr., Stk., Fag., Roth..

† So We., Now., Marti, Siev., Stk., Fag., Roth.; Schw. om. only "from upon, etc."; Kent drops "it is the oracle of Yahweh."

‡ Schw..

§ GASm..

---

* So, *e. g.*, Mau., Hi., Ke..

† So Schegg, Reinke, We., Or., Dav., Now., van H., *et al.*.

‡ *V.* Toy, *JBL.*, XXIV, 91–106.

§ So Marti, Now.^{K}, Siev., Stk., Fag., Roth..

** So Schw., Dav., Bach., Marti, Now.^{K}, Roth., Kent.

5. *And those prostrating themselves upon the roofs to the host of the heavens*] Here begin three specifications under the general charge made in v. ^{4}. The worship of the sun, moon and stars is given first place. It was prevalent throughout the period of Manasseh and Amon (2 K. $21^{3.\ 5.\ 21}$), and continued into the days of Josiah (2 K. $23^{5.\ 12}$). It was denounced by the prophets and the Deuteronomists as a current practice (Je. 7^{18} 8^{2} 19^{13} 44^{17-25} Dt. 4^{19} 17^{3} Ez. 8^{16}). Hints as to its character are supplied by Je. 44^{17-19} Ez. 8^{16} Jb. 31^{26}, and the fact that it was practised upon the housetops (*cf.* Je. 32^{29}) shows that it was offered directly to the heavenly bodies themselves, rather than to any representations of them. The Deuteronomic editor of the books of Kings attributed the fall of the northern kingdom, in part at least, to the prevalence there of this worship (2 K. 17^{16}; *cf.* Am. 5^{26}). Its prevalence in Judah at this time is generally attributed to the close contact, dating from the time of Ahaz (2 K. $16^{10\ ff.}$), between Judah and Assyria, where such worship had been carried on from time immemorial. It must be remembered, however, that the worship of the heavenly bodies, and especially that of the sun and moon, was a custom common to the ancient Semitic world* and hence likely to have persisted in Israel from early times.† Furthermore, such names as Baal-shamem (*CIS.*, No. 7), En-shemesh, Beth-shemesh, Har-ḥeres, Ḥeres, Timnath-ḥeres and Jericho make it clear that the Canaanitish Baalism, with which Israel had come into the closest possible contact, was vitally concerned with the worship of the heavenly bodies.‡ The reaction under Manasseh, due in part to the stimulus of foreign cults, did not introduce sun-worship as a new cult, but rather revitalised a worship which had long been known in Israel, though it had lain more or less dormant, or had been confined chiefly to the rural population, having had no official recognition.—*And those prostrating themselves to Yahweh who swear by Milcom*] 𝔐 introduces another "who swear" immediately after "themselves," thus rendering the structure rough and broken and creating a Hebrew syntactical usage otherwise unknown. Another serious difficulty with 𝔐 is that it makes the prophet put worshippers of Yahweh on the same level with worshippers of Milcom, both alike being doomed to destruction. Zephaniah's charge against his countrymen, however, is not that some of them have forsaken Yahweh for Milcom, but that in general they do not yield undivided allegiance to Yahweh, but worship Milcom and other gods alongside of Yahweh. The whole struggle of the prophets, on its strictly religious side, was in behalf of the idea that Yahweh alone was Israel's God. The masses of the people, however, did not reach this point of view until after the Exile. Indeed, the recently discovered papyri of Elephantine include a list of gifts for religious purposes by the Jewish colonists which shows that as late as the fifth century B.C. Yahweh was still under the humiliation of seeing the devotions of his people shared by two other deities, one of whom was the goddess Anath.* Another of the same group of papyri reveals a Jewish woman in a legal transaction taking oath both by Yahweh and by Sati, an Egyptian god.† The attitude of Zephaniah is in striking contrast with that of Elisha in the case of Naaman, the Syrian (2 K. $5^{18\text{ f.}}$), and thus illustrates the growth in the Hebrew thought of God. The proposal of Nestle to read "to the moon" instead of "to Yahweh" is attractive, but not convincing; moon-worship has already been included in the word against "those worshipping the host of the heavens" and needs no further consideration; while the change to the third person involved by the introduction of "Yahweh" is no uncommon occurrence when a prophet is speaking as the representative of Yahweh (*e. g.*, $1^{8.\,17}$ $3^{5.\,6}$ Am. $3^{1.\,2.\,7.\,8}$ Ho. $4^{6.\,9.\,10}$ Mi. $2^{12.\,13}$ 4^{7}). 𝔐 has "their king" in place of "Milcom," the difference being only one of vocalisation. The Vrss. unite in supporting the reading "Milcom" (*v. i.*), and on the whole this is preferable. Milcom was the god of the Ammonites (1 K. $11^{5.\,33}$ 2 K. 23^{13}) who with other gods shared Judah's hospitality toward all cults. *Cf.* Ez. $23^{27\text{ ff.}}$. In case the reading of 𝔐 is right, the essential meaning is the same. The title "king" is then applied not to Yahweh, King of kings and Lord of lords, but either to the various local deities throughout the land, each of whom was entitled "king" of his special city, the word of Jeremiah being in point here, viz., "according to the number of thy cities are thy gods, O Judah" (2^{28});* or to the Phœnician god Milk (whose name is regularly distorted to Molech in OT. and is thus made to suggest *bōsheth*=shame), whose very name meant "king" and whose cruel cultus was practised in Judah in Zephaniah's day (2 K. 23^{10} Je. 7^{31} 32^{25} Ez. $16^{20\,f.}$; *cf.* Lv. 18^{21} 20^{2-5}).† The chief objection to Milcom lies in the fact that after the time of Solomon who built high places to Milcom for his foreign wives (1 K. $11^{5.\ 7\ 𝔊.\ 33}$ 2 K. 23^{13}) no reference is made to his worship in Israel.‡ But this at best is only an *argumentum e silentio*. Furthermore, while Milk and Milcom are in one passage clearly differentiated (2 K. $23^{10.\ 13}$), it is probable that fundamentally they were closely related, being simply different members of the Baalistic pantheon (*cf.* Je. 32^{35}),§ and that the rites offered to them were closely similar.**—*And those who withdraw from following Yahweh*] This verse does not merely summarise in a general characterisation the practices of those condemned in vv. $^{4b.\ 5}$,†† nor does it contrast the apostate Jews of ^{6a} with the godless heathen of ^{6b};‡‡ but it adds a new class to the foregoing, viz., those who do not merely divide their loyalty between Yahweh and other gods, but rather actually reject Yahweh out and out; *cf.* 1^{12}. It is something worse than religious indifference;§§ it is open and downright apostasy.—*Even those who have not sought Yahweh, nor inquired of him*] This does but repeat in negative form what has just been said positively. There is hardly sufficient basis for the rejection of this verse as an interpolation.* The change to the third person has already occurred in v. ^{5} (*q. v.*); the metre of this str. is too irregular to warrant the elimination on the ground of the poor balance of this verse; and the thought though somewhat repetitiously expressed forms a fitting climax to the str..

---

* Baethgen, *Beiträge zur sem. Religionsgeschichte* (1888), 61 *ff.*.

† *Cf.* Hal., *ad loc.*.

‡ *Cf.* C. F. Burney, *EB.*, 4784; G. F. Moore, *EB.*, 3354 *f.*; L. B. Paton, *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, II, 288 *f.*.

---

* *V.* Sachau, *Die Aramäischen Papyrus aus Elephantine* (1911).

† Sayce and Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri from Assuan*, Papyrus F, l. 5.

---

* So Hal., who urges in further support of this view an interesting interpretation of the legends למלך זיף, למלך חברון, למלך עדרם, למלך שוכה, stamped upon old Hebrew jar-handles (Bliss and Macalister's *Excavations in Palestine*, 116–121) to the effect that the "kings" here named were the tutelary deities of their cities. *Cf.* מלקרת (=מלך קרית), god of Tyre.

† So Dav., GASm., Or.; G. F. Moore, *EB.*, 3085.

‡ Other allusions to Milcom are 2 S. 12^{30} 𝔊 Je. $49^{1.\ 3}$.

§ *Cf.* the name מלכבעל for a Phœnician deity in *CIS.*, Nos. 147, 194, 380.

** *Cf.*, *e. g.*, the king of Moab's sacrifice of his oldest son (probably to Chemosh, his god) with the Hebrew rites in honour of Molech (2 K. 3^{27}); *v.* also Lagrange, *Études sur les religions sémitiques*², 99 *ff.*.

†† *Contra* Hal..

‡‡ *Contra* Marti, similarly, Or., Hal..

§§ Or., Dr..

The metre of this str. is rough and uneven, being a mixture of hexameter and pentameter; but the parallelism is regular and clearly marked, thus indicating plainly the poetic lines. The arrangement here presented involves the setting aside of the latter part of v. ^{3}, beginning with והמכשלות, and also the dropping of the phrase עם הכהנים from v. ^{4} as a gloss. A threefold objection holds against the phrase והמכשלות את הרשעים in v. ^{3}, viz.: (1) no such discrimination between the righteous and the wicked is implied in the threats of the immediate context; (2) it lies outside of any possible metrical scheme; (3) the presence of the asterisk in 𝔊^{A}. The remainder of v. ^{3} does but weakly reiterate what has already been said in the opening words of the verse.

2. אסף] 𝔊, *ἐκλείψει.* 𝔙, *congregans.* Four codd. of Kenn. אסוף.—אָסֵף] This can only be a Hiph. juss. from סוף. But this is open to three objections, viz.: (1) the Hiph. of this vb. occurs only here and in Je. 8^{13} where the text is almost certainly corrupt; (2) the juss. is uncalled for here; (3) the use of the inf. abs. from a different root. An analogous case of the inf. of one vb. with the finite form of another occurs in Is. 28^{28}, אָדוֹשׁ יְדוּשֶׁנּוּ; but a root ארשׁ is otherwise unknown and the text is probably corrupt, unless Barth, *NB.*$^{\S 49b}$, be correct in supposing that forms like אָסֹף and אָדוֹשׁ are survivals of a primitive Hiph. inf. abs. form of the ע׳ו vb.. Rd. אֹסֵף as 1st pers. sg. impf. of אסף, with Stei., Or., Schw., We., Now., Ges.$^{\S 72aa}$, Marti, Siev., van H., Stk., Fag., Roth., Kent. For similar forms, *cf.* 1 S. 15^{6} 2 S. 6^{1} Mi. 4^{6} Ps. 104^{29}. *Cf.* Ges.$^{\S 68h.\ 113w}$.—כל] 𝔊^{BY} and Kenn. 245 om.; so Roth.(?).—**3.** אָסֵף] Rd. אֹסֵף both times as in v. ^{2}. Vrss. render as in v. ^{2}. Stk. אָסֹף, omitting it the second time as do also Fag., Kent.—והמכשלות את הרשעים] Rd. וְהִכְשַׁלְתִּי וגו׳; so GASm., Oort$^{Em.}$, Now.^{K}, van H., Roth., Kent. 𝔊, *καὶ ἀσθενήσουσιν οἱ ἀσεβεῖς* (𝔊^{ℵ}, *βασιλεις*). 𝔙, *et ruinae impiorum sunt.* 𝔖, *and I will bring the stumbling-block upon sinners.* HP. 36, 240, *καὶ τὰ σκάνδαλα σὺν τοῖς ἀσέβεσι.* HP. 130, 211 om. the phrase, while 𝔊^{A} has it under asterisk. Bach., וְיִמָּחוּ שמות הר׳. Schw., וְכִשַּׁלְתִּי וגו׳. We., הַמַּכְשֵׁלִים וגו׳; so Fag.. Marti, וְהִשְׁמַדְתִּי וגו׳; so Stk.. 𝔙's rendering of 𝔐 is correct, viz., 'ruins' ('stumbling-blocks' calls for the text as emended by We.); but it is hardly an appropriate term in this context; it would be intelligible only in the pregnant sense 'ruins about to be made.' 𝔊 𝔖 seem to presuppose a verbal form and dittog. would account for מ of 𝔐 since מ and כ are so easily confused; *v.* on Mi. 1^{2}. Or.'s objection to this reading as too weak is not well taken, in view of 2 Ch. 25^{8} 28^{23} Je. 6^{21}.—הרשעים] A word much more common in exilic and postexilic writings than in earlier times; but its occurrence in pre-exilic literature is frequent enough to make it unsafe to base an argument for the late date of a passage upon this word, especially when the writing in question is as close to the exile as Zephaniah.—את־האדם] 𝔊, *τοὺς ἀνόμους*; so Schw.. GASm., אָדָם רָשָׁע. 𝔊 may have arisen through *ανους* as an abbreviation for *ἀνθρώπους*; in any case neither ר׳ nor עִיר can easily have been changed to אדם.—**4.** שאר] 𝔊, *τὰ ὀνόματα* = שֵׁם; so 2 codd. of Kenn. and one more in margin; so also Schw. (*cf.* Ho. 2^{19}), Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, Marti, Siev., Dr. (?), Stk., Roth.. But 𝔐 deserves preference as the harder reading and because if 𝔊 were correct we should have expected שם with הכהנים also. —את־שם] Rd. ואת־שם, with 𝔊 𝔖 𝔙 𝔗, and many Heb. codd.; so Or., Marti, Siev., Fag., Roth.. We., on basis of asyndeton of 𝔐, suggests om. of את־שם as a variant of את־שאר; so Stk..—הכמרים] A word occurring in Strassburg Papyrus 1^{3}, in the Elephantine papyri published by Sayce and Cowley (E 15) and by Sachau (1^{5}), and on the Teima Stone; always applied to non-Yahwistic priests. It was a common Semitic word being now known in Hebrew, Aramaic, Syriac, Nabatæan, Punic (*v.* G. A. Cooke, *North-Semitic Ins.*, Nos. 64, 65, 69, 98; Lidzbarski, *Handbuch d. nordsem. Epigr.*, 297) and Assyrian (a high Babylonian official is called *Kamiru* in Amarna Letters, No. I, 15, 33; and an Arabic priestess is entitled *Kumirtu* in an ins. of Ashurbanipal; *v. KAT.*^{3}, 467).—עם־הכהנים] 𝔊$^{\text{BA}}$ 𝔄 om.; in marg. of 𝔖$^{\text{H}}$ with asterisk; but found in HP. 22, 36, 42, 51, 62, 68, 86, 87, 95, 97, 147, 185, 228, 233, 238, 240, 310, Complut., Arm., Slav..—**5.** הגגות] 𝔊$^{\text{א}}$, *ἴδολα*. Eight mss. of Kenn. and 7 of de R., הגנות.—ואת המשתחוים הנשבעים ליהוה] 𝔊$^{\text{A}}$ 𝔄, HP. 49, 106, 153, 233 om.; while 𝔖$^{\text{H}}$ has all of it in marg. under asterisk and only ואת־המש׳ is om. by 𝔊$^{\text{Q}}$, HP. 23, 26, 36, 40, 42, 51, 62, 86, 95, 97, 114, 130, 147, 185, 238, 239, 240, 311 and Arm.. "Swearing by י׳" was a perfectly legitimate proceeding as appears from Is. 19^{18} 45^{23} 2 Ch. 15^{14}, in all of which it means 'worship י׳.' But the phrase הנש׳ לְ here encounters three difficulties, viz.: (1) it is a useless repetition of the thought of the immediately preceding word; (2) it renders the sentence heavy and awkward; (3) if ליהוה were correct after הנש׳, we should expect למלכם likewise. The state of 𝔊 indicates very much uncertainty as to the text at a relatively early date. The omission of המשתחוים as a dittog. would leave an admirably balanced line; but ליהוה follows it more easily than it does הנש׳ in this context. Hence the latter is better om., with We., Schw., Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, Now., Or., Marti, Dr. (?), van H., Fag., Roth. and Kent, as a dittog. or a marg. correction of the foll. והנש׳.—ליהוה] Or. adds צבאות. Nestle suggests לַיָּרֵחַ; so Marti, Now.$^{\text{K}}$, Stk.; *cf.* Dt. 17^{3} Je. 8^{2} Jb. 31^{6}.—

---

* *Contra* Marti, Now.^{K}, Fag., Kent.

והנשבעים] Om. ו with 𝔊$^{\aleph A}$; so Hi., Stei., We., Now., Marti, Dr. (?), Stk.. The om. of את here points to the absence of ו originally. The whole word is om. by 𝔊^{Q*}, HP. 26, 130, 311. Eth. reads, "and those swearing in the name of ׳י their king deceitfully"; similarly, 𝔗.—במלכם] Rd. בְּמִלְכֹּם, with 𝔊^{Y}, HP. 22, 36, 51, 95, 185, 238 (all = *μελχομ*), 𝔖 𝔙; so Hi., Stei., We., Now., Marti, Siev., van H., Stk., Fag., Roth., Kent. 𝔊$^{Q\ \text{marg.}}$, HP. 62, 86, 147, *μολοχ*. 𝔖^{H}, *by the king their God.* 𝔗, *their idols.* HP. 114, *κατὰ τοῦ Μελχου*; 240, *κατὰ Μολχομ*.—6. דרשׁהו] 𝔊, *ἀντεχομένους τοῦ κυρίου*. For a comparison of דרשׁ with בקשׁ, *v.* H.^{AH}, 113.

§ 3. THE TERRORS OF THE DAY OF YAHWEH (1$^{7-18}$).

A vivid picture of the terrible judgment now so near at hand. The poem falls into eleven short strs. of two lines each, as though the burden of the message were too heavy to be borne by strs. of greater length. Str. I announces the near approach of the dread day (1^{7}); II pronounces judgment upon the king's counsellors (1$^{8a.\ 9b}$); III deals with those who practise social and religious customs of foreign origin (1$^{8b.\ 9a}$); IV describes the woe to come upon every quarter of the city (1$^{10.\ 11a}$); V vividly represents the impossibility of the escape of any guilty man (1$^{12a.\ b}$); VI shows how such men will realise their mistake in disregarding Yahweh (1$^{12c.\ 13a}$); VII reiterates the announcement that Yahweh's day is near (1^{14}); VIII and IX characterise that day with its terrors (1$^{15.\ 16}$); X describes the pitiful condition of mankind on that day (1^{17}); and XI closes the poem with the threat of a most complete destruction (1$^{18a.\ c}$).

SILENCE in the presence of the Lord Yahweh, for Yahweh's day is near at hand!
For Yahweh has prepared a sacrifice, he has consecrated his guests.
AND I will punish the princes and the king's sons,
Who fill their master's house with violence and deceit.
AND I will punish every one who leaps over the threshold,
And every one who clothes himself with foreign raiment.
HARK! a cry from the Fish-gate, and a wail from the New-Town;
And a great crash from the hills, and a wail from the Mortar.
FOR at that time, I will search Jerusalem with a lamp,
And I will punish those who are at ease, thickened upon their lees;
THOSE who say in their hearts, "Yahweh does neither good nor bad";
And their substance will become a ruin, and their houses a desolation.

NEAR at hand is Yahweh's great day, near and speeding fast;
Near at hand is Yahweh's bitter day, hastening faster than a warrior.
A DAY of wrath is that day, a day of distress and straitness;
A day of desolation and waste, a day of darkness and gloom.
A DAY of cloud and thunder-cloud, a day of the trumpet and battle-cry,
Against the fortified cities and against the lofty battlements.
AND I will press hard upon mankind and they shall walk like blind men, because they have sinned against me;
And their blood shall be poured out like dust, and their flesh like dung.
NEITHER their silver nor their gold can deliver them;
For a full destruction, yea, a fearful one, will Yahweh make of all the inhabitants of the land.

Str. I, in a striking figure, declares that the day of Yahweh is close at hand, all preparations having been made.—**7.** *Silence in the presence of the Lord Yahweh!*] By this command for a solemn hush, the prophet vividly conveys his feeling of the immediate proximity of God. At the same time, the silence he enjoins was probably a characteristic feature of the sacrificial ritual, which is here used figuratively. We are reminded of the Latin *favete linguis* (Horace, *Odes*, 3 : 1, 2; Vergil, *Æneid*, 5 : 71).* Smend declares that the Arabs also "stood around the altar a long time still and silent after the performance of the sacrificial slaughter" and that this was the time when the deity was thought to approach the altar.† For similar injunctions to silence in the presence of Yahweh, *cf.* Hb. 2^{20} Zc. 2^{13} Am. 6^{10}.—*For near at hand is the day of Yahweh*] The thought of this dread day bulks larger in Zephaniah than in any preceding prophet.‡ It is the black shadow that overcasts all of his message. He agrees with Amos, the creator of the ethical conception of the day of Yahweh, in supposing its advent to be imminent (*cf.* 1^{14}) and in making it a day of judgment. The ethical aspect of the judgment is less prominent in Zephaniah than in Amos; but, on the other hand, more stress is laid upon its universal scope ($1^{2.\ 3}$ $2^{4-6.\ 12.\ 13}$ 3^{8}). The probability is that as Amos connected the day of Yahweh with the operations of Urartu or Assyria in the west, so Zephaniah's expectation of the day was aroused by the onslaught of the Scythians (*v.* Intr., § 2). But neither Amos nor Zephaniah looked upon the invasion of the foreigner as exhausting the terrors of the judgment. War, drought, pestilence and cataclysmic convulsions of nature were all to contribute toward the appalling catastrophe. Natural events were but the forerunners of more terrible supernatural phenomena. The near approach of the end of the age, the indispensable prerequisite of the dawn of the new and better day, is a constant feature of the prophetic idea of Yahweh's day (*e. g.*, Am. 6^{3} Is. 13^{6} Jo. 1^{15} 2^{1}).—*For Yahweh has prepared a sacrifice*] This is the first instance of Yahweh's judgment upon Israel being represented as a sacrificial feast. The figure is taken up and expanded by Ezekiel ($39^{17\,\text{ff.}}$; *cf.* Is. 25^{6} 34^{6} Je. 46^{10} Rev. $19^{17\,\text{f.}}$). The victim, of course, is Judah. —*He has consecrated his guests*] Such preparation, involving purification from all uncleanness, was necessary to participation in the sacrificial meal; *cf.* 1 S. 16^{5}. The participant must pass from the sphere of the profane into that of the holy. Wild beasts and birds of prey constitute the 'guests' in Ezekiel's representation; but here the guests are left undetermined. Some would identify them with the Chaldeans;* others prefer the Scythians;† while Gressmann‡ declares that guests and victim are the same, viz., Judah. Davidson feels a certain inconsistency in the figure, in that it represents Yahweh as slaying the sacrifice, whereas the real slaughterers are the guests themselves, viz., Israel's foes. All such attempts to interpret the figure in every detail seem to ignore the ideal element in the representation. The only essential feature of the figure is the picture of Judah as a sacrificial victim about to experience the punitive wrath of Yahweh. The remaining features are but accessory circumstances, necessary to the rounding out of the view, but never intended to be taken literally.§ For evidence that guests were invited to participate in sacrifices, *cf.* 1 S. $9^{13.\,22}$ 2 S. 6^{19} 15^{11} 1 K. 1^{9} Ne. 8^{10} and the common usage among the Arabs.** The argument for removing v. ^{7} from its present position to another, whether preceding v. ^{2} as the opening sentence of the prophecy,†† or preceding v. ^{14} and there opening a new poem,* is not sufficiently strong. The use of the third person between the verbs of v. ^{4} and v. ^{8}, which are in the first person, is not a serious consideration in view of prophetic usage and in any case is not obviated unless v. ^{6} be also eliminated. Even then, matters are not helped much, when v. ^{7} in the third person is transferred solely for that reason and placed before v. ^{2}, which is in the first person.

---

* So Schw..

† *Rel.*^{2}, 140.

‡ For a sketch of the historical development of this idea, *v.* JMPS., *AJTh.*, V, 505–33. *Cf.* H.^{AH}, 131 *f.*; Gressmann, *Eschatologie*, 141 *ff.*.

---

* So Abar., Jer., Rosenm., Mau., Hd..

† So Ew., Dr.; *cf.* We..

‡ *Eschatologie*, 136 *f*..

§ So van H..

** WRS.$^{\text{Rel.}}$, 236 *f*.; We., *Reste d. Arab. Heidenthums*, 114 *f*..

†† So Marti, Fag., Kent.

Str. II, threatening the king's household with punishment, is introduced by a line in prose, contributed by some editor,† viz., **8a.** *And it will come to pass in the day of Yahweh's sacrifice*] A slight emendation would make this read, "in the day of my sacrifice," and do away with the difficulty felt by some as to the use of the third person; but this difficulty would not be a serious one, even if this line were a part of the original text.—*I will punish the princes and the king's sons*] Lit., 'visit upon,' a common idiom for 'punish,' especially in Je. (*e. g.*, 5^{9} 9^{25} 11^{22} 25^{12} 36^{31}; *cf.* $23^{2.\ 12}$). The royal family and the members of the court are here held responsible for the wickedness of the times, the king himself having been too young probably at this time to have taken the reins of government into his own hands; *cf.* 2 K. 22^{1}. In any case, the reference here cannot be to the sons of Josiah, the eldest of whom was not born until six years after Josiah assumed the crown (2 K. 23^{36} 22^{1}) and was not old enough to have wielded any influence until well toward the close of Josiah's long reign. Zephaniah's relationship to the royal family (*v.* on 1^{1}) gave him a position at court which enabled him to keep in touch with all that was going on and to expose the secret machinations of those high in authority.—**9b.** *Who fill their master's house*] *i. e.*, the king's palace, not the temple of Yahweh as in 𝔊. The charge is not that they use the palace as a storehouse for stolen goods, nor even primarily that they enrich the royal treasury through fraud and oppression; but that they themselves by their conduct and character make the king's house a symbol and synonym of all that is bad. Where righteousness should reign, iniquity abounds.—*With violence and deceit*] This is the true prophetic cry. *Cf.* Am. 3^{10} Is. $3^{14\ f.}$ Mi. $2^{2.\ 8.\ 9}$ $3^{1\text{-}3.\ 9.\ 10}$ Ez. $22^{27\text{-}29}$. Here and in $1^{13.\ 18}$ Zephaniah shows that he too, like his great predecessors, was sensitive to the miseries and wrongs of the poor. For the justification of the transposition of v. ^{9b}, *v. i.*.

---

* So Siev..

† So Marti, Siev., Now.^{K}, Fag., Du., Kent.

Str. III devotes itself to the denunciation of certain practices of foreign origin, the adoption of which indicates disloyalty to the old, long-established customs and ideals.—**9a.** *And I will punish every one who leaps over the threshold*] The precise significance of this action is unknown. Many have been the interpretations placed upon it. 𝔊's rendering yields no sense. 𝔗, with many successors, finds the meaning furnished by 1 S. 5^5, where the worshippers of Dagon are said to avoid stepping upon the threshold of his sanctuary, because of the fact that Dagon had fallen across that threshold and been broken to pieces in the presence of the ark; a similar custom has now come into vogue in the temple of Yahweh; *cf.* Is. 2^6. Jerome also interprets the custom of the threshold of the temple, but finds the blame in the arrogance with which the worshippers tread the courts of Yahweh. Hitzig refers the custom to the threshold of the king's palace and cites the testimony of travellers to the effect that the Persians crossed the king's threshold without touching it and with the right foot forward.[*] W. Robertson Smith[†] and Driver see here a reference to the foreign body-guard of the Jewish king, his Philistine janissaries (2 S. 15^{18} 2 K. 1^{38}). Another series of interpretations refers the custom to the palaces of the rich, making Zephaniah condemn, for example, the eagerness with which the servants of the rich rush out of their palaces to seize the property of the less powerful;[‡] or the guardians of the portals of the palaces of the great (2 S. $1^{9.13}$ $15^{2\,ff.}$), who abuse their position by extorting money from those who would seek their master's aid.[§] Kimchi, on the other hand, finds the reference to the thresholds of the poor, the doors of whose houses are burst open by the rich in their search after the goods of their weaker neighbours.[**] It is unlikely, however, that Zephaniah would charge the great and powerful nobles with petty larceny. The threshold of the house has been regarded as a favourite abode of demons and spirits among practically all races.* It seems probable, therefore, that the prophet spoke of some superstitious practice (perhaps, though not necessarily, of foreign origin) which was now in vogue particularly among the rich. It is more likely to have been connected with private houses than with either the temple or the royal palace exclusively. The next line, at least, concerns itself with a custom primarily of social rather than religious significance.—*In that day*] *i. e.*, the day of Yahweh. This is a gloss added by some zealous hand;† it overburdens the line and adds no essential thought.—*And every one who clothes himself with foreign raiment*] *i. e.*, the fops of the day, who followed after the latest imported styles. The serious aspect of the practice was the evidence it afforded of the decay of the national spirit and pride. Furthermore, the nation and its god were inseparable, and to abandon or neglect distinctive national customs was to be disloyal to Yahweh. Imported garments were naturally expensive and could be obtained only by the wealthier classes (2 S. 13^{18} Mt. 11^{8}). The prohibition in the law (Dt. 22^{11} Lv. 19^{19}) commonly cited in connection with this passage has no bearing whatever upon the question here, since it springs out of a different circle of ideas.

---

[*] So in the time of della Valle and Olearius.

[†] *Old Testament and the Jewish Church*^{2}, 261 *f.*.

[‡] So, *e. g.*, Hd..

[§] So, *e. g.*, van H..

[**] So also de W., Ew., Ke..

Str. IV strikingly presents a picture of the distress that will overwhelm Jerusalem on Yahweh's day. The str. is introduced by a line of prose, probably of editorial origin.‡—**10.** *And it will come to pass in that day, it is the oracle of Yahweh*] The introduction of this line blunts the edge of the cry that follows, which left in its original abruptness is startlingly vivid.—*Hark! a cry from the Fish-gate*] This was one of the entrances to the city of Jerusalem on the north side, the exact location of which we cannot determine. It probably corresponded to the present Damascus Gate, opening upon the roadway along the bed of the Tyropœon Valley.§ According to Ne. 3^{3} 12^{39}, it stood between the "Old Gate" and the "Sheep Gate," near to the tower of Hananel. According to 2 Ch.

---

* *V.* H. C. Trumbull, *The Threshold Covenant* (1896), 10 *ff.*; Baur, *Mittheilungen und Nachrichten d. Deutschen Pal. Vereins*, for 1899, p. 10.

† So Marti, Now.^{K}, Siev., Fag., Du., Kent. Gr. om. as dittog. from v. ^{10}, while Schw. tr. it to the beginning of v. ^{9}.

‡ So Marti, Fag., Du., Kent. Siev. om. all but the opening והיה.

§ *V.* GASm., *Jerusalem*, I, 201 *f.*; Merrill, *Ancient Jerusalem*, 359; Paton, *Jerusalem in Bible Times*, 120 *f.*.

33^{14}, it was a part of the new wall built by Manasseh. It may have been identical with the "Middle Gate" of Je. 39^{1-3}, standing in the middle of the line of the north wall. The name Fish-gate may be accounted for by the fact that Jerusalem depended largely upon the fishermen of Tyre for its fish supply (Ne. 13^{16}); and these probably entered the city by this gate as affording the nearest entry or giving them easiest access to the fish-market.* The prophet in imagination places himself in the midst of the coming scene of desolation and listens to the sounds of grief and ruin that fill the air.—*And a wail from the New-Town*] Lit., the second (town). A section of the city located probably near the Fish-gate. We have no precise information concerning the site of this part of the town; it is mentioned elsewhere only in 2 K. 22^{14} (= 2 Ch. 34^{22}) and possibly in Ne. 11^{9}. But it probably was that portion added to the city by the building of Manasseh's wall, constituting the oldest suburb on the north. Lying on lower ground than the older city and so more easy of access to an invader, it would naturally be the first to suffer at the hands of an enemy. As a matter of fact, the natural defences of Jerusalem rendered her impregnable on every side but the north and every siege of the city has been laid against that side.—*And a great crash from the hills*] These are not the hills lying around Jerusalem, but those within the city itself; whether those in the south and south-west quarters occupied by the temple, the palace and the houses of the rich, or those in the higher portions of the north end of the city, or the hills of the city as a whole, cannot be exactly ascertained. It is possible that some of the higher portions of the town were known as "the Hills" or "the Heights." The use of titles for the other quarters here named seems to point in that direction. The "crash" is probably that caused by the downfall of walls and buildings re-echoing from hill to hill.—**11**a. *And a wail from the Mortar*] 𝔐 reads, "Wail, O inhabitants of the Mortar." But the parallelism seems to call for a fourth member constructed of a noun and a prepositional phrase as are the three preceding members. What part of the town was known as "the Mortar" is wholly uncertain, since the name is nowhere else employed. Jerome thought of the vale of Siloam; 𝔗 of the valley of the Kidron; and Josephus (*Wars*, V, 4, 1) connected it with the Tyropœon Valley. Maurer, on the other hand, declared it to be a figurative name for Jerusalem as a whole (*cf.* Je. 21[13]), which, surrounded by higher hills, was to serve as a mortar for the braying of her inhabitants. Most modern interpreters identify it with the upper part of the Tyropœon, partly because of the fitness of the title as applied to that region, partly because the context seems to make the Mortar a centre of trade and industry and the Tyropœon furnishes an excellent site for a market,* and partly because both Fish-gate and Mishneh were on the north and the Maktesh probably lay in the same general region. The last consideration, however, is not a legitimate one; the prophet may have been picturing the desolation and grief which were to overwhelm the entire city rather than some one special quarter therein. The Fish-gate and the Mishneh, it is true, probably lay on the north side; but "the Hills" and "the Mortar" are completely unknown. Hence, it is unsafe to confine the distress described by the prophet to the north side alone.—The remainder of v. [11] seems to be a later interpolation, interrupting the flow of thought by the introduction of unnecessary detail and departing too widely from the metrical norm of the context to be brought into harmony with the form of the rest of the poem.†—**11b.** *For all the people of Canaan are destroyed*] The speaker may mean Phœnician traders who were the merchants of the oriental world;‡ or better still, the merchant class among the Jews themselves, which enriches itself by unjust measures and trickery of every sort.§ For the use of the term "Canaanite" as denoting the trader and merchant, *cf.* Ho. 12[8] Is. 23[8] Ez. 16[29] 17[4] Pr. 31[24] Jb. 41[6] and, perhaps, Zc. 14[21]. The parallel line seems to show that a class of financiers is meant, whether of native or of foreign origin.—**11c.** *Cut off are all those who weigh out money*] Not money-changers especially, but the whole merchant class in general. The weighing of the silver was necessitated by the fact that there was no Hebrew coinage prior to the Exile. Indeed, it is not certain that there was a fixed coinage anywhere in the Semitic world prior to the time of the Persian empire. In Babylonia, as far back as the time of the first dynasty (*c.* 2000 B.C.), stamped money was in use.* Later on, Assyrian ingots stamped with the head of Ishtar served as recognised currency; while Sennacherib, in a recently discovered inscription, alludes to "casting half-shekel pieces,"† which even if not coins in the technical sense evidently served the purpose of coins.‡ It is doubtful whether Zephaniah himself would have shared such a hostility to trade and commerce as is reflected in this verse, though it is true that the old prophetic spirit was opposed to the increasing complexity and luxury of life involved in the advance of civilisation and stood firmly for a return to primitive nomadic simplicity.

---

* *Cf.* GASm., *Jerusalem*, I, 317 *f.*.

---

* *V.* Merrill, *Ancient Jerusalem*, 291–307.

† So Marti, Siev., Fag.. *Cf.* Du., who erects 1[10. 11] into an independent poem.

‡ So, *e. g.*, Dr..

§ So most interpreters.

Str. V sets forth the thoroughness with which Yahweh will search for the wicked in order that he may visit their sins upon them.—**12a.** *And it will be at that time, that I will search Jerusalem with a lamp*] Like Diogenes, Yahweh will go up and down the streets of the city. The figure expresses the thought of the impossibility of escape from the avenging eye of Yahweh. *Cf.* Je. 5[1] Ez. 22[30] Ps. 139[7-12]. The figure is probably borrowed from the custom of the night-watchman carrying his lamp and may involve also the thought of the diligent search of Jerusalem that will be made by her conquerors in their quest for spoil. *Cf.* Is. 45[3] Lk. 15[8]. The houses of the orient being small and dark, a thorough search required the aid of artificial illumination.—**12b.** *And I will punish those who are at ease*] 𝔐 reads "the men" for "those at ease"; but this would be poor Hebrew, unless men were to be distinguished from women and children, which can hardly be the prophet's thought. The epithet "at ease" is applied to the same class of people in Am. 6[1] Is. 32[9. 11] Zc. 1[15] Ps. 123[4]. It denotes freedom from anxiety and a complete satisfaction with oneself. They are further characterised in the following suggestive figure.—*Who are*

---

* *V.* Meissner, *BAS.*, II, 559 *f.*. *Cf.* Sayce, *Contemporary Review*, August, 1907, p. 259.

† The new Sennacherib prism, No. 103,000, col. vii, 18; copied and translated by L. W. King, *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum*, part xxvi (1909).

‡ *Cf.* C. H. W. Johns, *Did the Assyrians Coin Money?* (*Exp.*, 1899), pp. 389–400. Lehmann-Haupt, *Israel: seine Entwicklung im Rahmen der Weltgeschichte* (1911), p. 162, claims that the coinage of money was invented by Alyattes, king of the Cimmerians, in the sixth century B.C..

thickening upon their lees] The metaphor is based upon the treatment of wine in the process of its ripening. *Cf.* Is. 25^{6}. The usual treatment is well set forth in Je. $48^{11.\ 12}$. These men have been left undisturbed in their false security; they have not been "poured from vessel to vessel." Just as wine left too long in such a condition thickens and loses strength, so these men have sunk into weak self-indulgence, having lost all interest in and concern for the higher things of life and being solicitous only for their own bodily comfort and slothful ease.

Str. VI further describes these indifferent citizens and pronounces judgment upon them.—**12c.** *Those who say in their hearts, "Yahweh does neither good nor bad"*] The terms "good" and "bad" here are not used in an ethical sense, but in the sense of "favourable" and "unfavourable." In accordance with a well-known Hebrew idiom, the phrase in reality says that Yahweh does nothing at all; he is without influence upon human affairs and may be ignored by practical men. Similar phrases coupling together two terms of opposite meaning and subsuming everything under them in order to express the idea of totality are "the shut up and the freed" (Dt. 32^{36} 1 K. 14^{10} 21^{21} 2 K. 9^{8} 14^{26}), "the moist with the dry" (Dt. 29^{19}), "the deceived and the deceiver" (Jb. 12^{16}).* The state of mind indicated by the prophet means practical atheism. While not proclaiming their thought upon the housetops, these men by their actions show that in their heart of hearts they deny God any part in the affairs of men. This has ever been the temptation of a cultured and commercial age. As man's place and power in the world increase, God decreases. Discernible only by the spiritual vision, he is ever in danger of being hidden from the eyes of the mass of men by the increasing bulk of their material interests. This same attitude of mind is attested by Je. $5^{12\text{ f.}}$ Mal. 2^{17} Ps. 10^{4} 14^{1}. The charge of powerlessness or non-participation in human affairs, here preferred against Yahweh, is one used with telling effect by the later prophets to demonstrate the futility of idolatry (Je. 10^{5} Is. 41^{23}).—**13a.** *And their wealth will become a ruin and their houses a desolation*] Those who have lived in careless disregard of God will be rudely awakened from their fatuous ease by being brought face to face with indisputable evidence of his power. The treasures they have accumulated and the palaces they have reared will fall into the hands of an invading foe. That for which they have laboured and in which they have trusted will fail and forsake them in their day of need. The God whom they have ignored will force his unwelcome presence upon them in avenging justice. The remainder of this verse is redundant, being due to a marginal citation of a passage very common in the prophetic writings which was suggested by the language here.*—**13b, c.** *And they will build houses and not inhabit them, and plant vineyards and not drink their wine*] *Cf.* Am. 5^11 Mi. 6^15 Dt. 28^30. 39 Ez. 28^26 Is. 65^21 f.. The day of Yahweh as announced in 1^7-14 would seem to have been too close at hand in the mind of Zephaniah for him to have contemplated the possibility of sufficient time elapsing for the building of houses and planting of vineyards.

---

* *V.* Dr., *Dt.* (*ICC*), 376, where the idiom is illustrated from the Arabic.

Str. VII starts a new section of the poem which is devoted to a description of the terrors of Yahweh's day. Its immediate proximity is first re-emphasised.—**14.** *Near at hand is Yahweh's great day, near and speeding fast*] What has already been said in v. ^7 is here "amplified with increased energy of language." † The greatness of this day and its terror are standing features of the prophetic pictures of judgment. *Cf.* Jo. 2^11. 31 Mal. 4^5.—*Near at hand is Yahweh's bitter day, hastening faster than a warrior*] For text, *v. i.*. "Bitter" is an epithet not elsewhere applied to the day, but one thoroughly representative of its character. *Cf.* Am. 8^10. The text of this line according to 𝔐 is very difficult and furnishes no close parallelism with the preceding line. The usual rendering is "Hark! (or "the voice of") the day of Yahweh! The mighty man crieth there (or "then") bitterly." For similar representations, *cf.* Is. 13^7. 8 Je. 30^5-7. Another rendering runs, "The sound of (or "Hark!") the day of Yahweh is bitter; the mighty man crieth there (or "then")." But such renderings fail to overcome the difficulties, viz.: (1) the adverb "there" is without any antecedent to which it can easily be referred, while the meaning "then" for this particle is not well established; (2) the order of words in the latter part of the line is wholly abnormal, and that without any corresponding gain in strength that is appreciable; (3) the term "strong man" is undefined; (4) if "bitter" be taken with the first half of the line, it forms an unsuitable predicate to "sound," and when treated as predicate to "day," the resulting sentence "the day of Yahweh is bitter" furnishes an inappropriate continuation of the particle "Hark"; if "bitter" be connected with the second half of the line, the rhythmical balance of the line is disturbed. The emendation here proposed furnishes a line which is exactly parallel to the preceding line, reiterating its thought in stronger terms. The final clause may mean either that the onrush of the day of Yahweh is swifter than that of the warrior upon his foe, or that it will be too swift for the warrior to escape.

---

* So Schw., GASm., Now., Marti, Siev., Fag., Du., Kent.

† Ew..

Str. VIII piles up epithets descriptive of the terrors of Yahweh's day.—**15.** *A day of wrath is that day*] *Dies iræ dies illa*, 𝔙's translation of this sentence, forms the opening phrase of the great hymn on the Last Judgment, by Thomas of Celano (*c.* 1250 A.D.). For similar emphasis upon the divine anger in connection with the day of Yahweh, *cf.* v. [18] Is. 13[9] Ez. 7[19] Pr. 11[4] Jb. 21[30]. The effects of Yahweh's wrath are enumerated in the following clauses. —*A day of distress and straits*] This and the following clause are examples of the paronomasia so common in prophetic literature. This kind of a day was exactly contrary to the old popular expectation (Am. 5[18]).—*A day of desolation and devastation*]. The same phrase recurs in Jb. 30[3] 38[27]. The primitive chaos will once more hold sway. The parallelism would be improved here by transposing this clause to the beginning of v. [16], as Marti suggests.—*A day of darkness and gloom*] This and the following clause are found again in Jo. 2[2]. The terrors of darkness are a standing feature of the prophets' day of Yahweh. *Cf.* Am. 5[18. 20] Is. 13[10] Ez. 34[12]. The figure was probably learned from observation of eclipses of the sun, though it may reflect the darkness that so frequently precedes and accompanies a great storm.

Str. IX continues the description, passing from the terrors of nature to those of war.—**15e.** *A day of cloud and thunder-cloud*] The same phenomenon is described in Ez. 34[12], where the reference is to the fall of Jerusalem and the deportation which lay behind the speaker. This is a characteristic frequently connected with theophanies in OT.; the word "cloud" occurs no less than fifty-eight times in such connections.*—**16.** *A day of the trumpet and battle-cry*] The prophet now turns to the horrors of war. The combination of the blowing of horns† and shouting is found also in Am. 1^{15} 2^{2} Je. 4^{19} Jos. 6^{5}. *Cf.* Ju. $7^{18.\,22}$.—*Against the fortified cities and against the lofty battlements*] *Cf.* Is. 2^{15}. The word rendered "battlements" is literally "corners," but here and in 3^{6} 2 Ch. 26^{15} BS. 50^{2} it probably denotes special fortifications constructed for the protection of the angles of the walls.‡ The character and strength of the walls and fortifications of ancient cities in Palestine may now be learned not only from an examination of the walls of Jerusalem, but also those of Jericho, Gezer, Lachish, Taanach, Megiddo, Tell-Zakarîya, Tell-es-Safi and Samaria.§ The number and size of such fortresses may be inferred from the fact that Sennacherib in his report of the campaign against Hezekiah claims to have captured "forty-six of his strong cities, fortresses and smaller towns without number." Not only so, but the great fortress of Jericho as revealed by the recent excavations was only about eleven hundred feet long and five hundred feet wide.

Str. X leaves the fortresses and turns attention to their occupants.—**17.** *And I will press hard upon mankind and they shall walk like blind men*] Men will be reduced to such straits by Yahweh that their attempts to discover a way of escape will be like the uncertain and hopeless steps of the blind. *Cf.* Dt. 28^{29} Na. 3^{11} Is. 59^{10} Jb. 12^{25}. There is no causal connection in the prophet's mind between the darkness of v. ^{15} and the groping here predicted.** "Mankind" here does not comprise the human race as a whole, but rather sets human beings in contrast with city walls and fortifications. As a matter of fact, the citizens of Judah are in the forefront of the prophet's thought, if they do not even exclude all others from consideration.—*Because they have sinned against me*] This sin is practically rebellion against Yahweh; for a similar usage of the word 'sin' as = 'rebellion,' *cf.* 2 K. 18^{14} and the regular sense of its Assyrian equivalent, *ḫîṭu*. This clause is omitted as a gloss by several interpreters[*] on the ground that the change to the third person (𝔐 = against Yahweh) is too abrupt so soon after the occurrence of the first person and that it is superfluous metrically. The emendation of the text necessary to conform it to the first person is very slight (*v. i.*) and at the same time eases the metrical difficulty.—*And their blood shall be poured out like dust*] *Cf.* Ps. 79^{3} 18^{42}. Human life will be as worthless as the dust of the streets. For a radically different estimate of the value of the people of God, *cf.* Ps. 72^{14}.—*And their flesh like dung*] *Cf.* Je. 9^{21} 16^{4} Ps. 83^{10} Jb. 20^{7}. The word "flesh" occurs only here and in Jb. 20^{23}, where the text and meaning are as uncertain as here. It has been variously rendered, *e. g.*, viscera,[†] carcasses,[‡] vigour,[§] sap.[**] The rendering 'flesh'[††] rests upon 𝔊 (*v. i.*) and is supported also by the usage in Arabic.

---

* So BDB.. † *V.* H.$^{\text{AH}}$, 43 *f.*.

‡ Tacitus describes the walls of Jerusalem as, "per artem obliquos et introrsum sinuatos ut latera oppugnantium ad ictus patescerent" (*Hist.*, lib. V, cap. 11, § 5).

§ For reports on Jericho, *v. Mittheilungen d. Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft*, Nos. 39 and 41. For Taanach, *v.* E. Sellin, *Tell Ta'anek.* For Megiddo, *v.* G. Schumacher, *Tell-el-Mutesellim.* For Lachish, *v.* F. J. Bliss, *A Mound of Many Cities.* For Tell-es-Safi and Tell-Zakarîya, *v.* F. J. Bliss and R. A. S. Macalister, *Excavations in Palestine*, 1898–1900. *Cf.* Dr., *Modern Research as Illustrating the Bible*, 54 *ff.*, 92. The work at Samaria is not yet finished, but preliminary announcements appear from time to time in the *Harvard Theological Review.*

** *Contra* Hi..

Str. XI brings the poem to a close with a representation of the completeness and inevitableness of the coming destruction.—**18.** *Neither their silver nor their gold can deliver them*] The things they have held most dear will be of no avail in the great day. *Cf.* Is. 13^{17}, where the Medes, the agents of Yahweh, are said to care nothing for silver and gold. The Scythian invasion, according to Herodotus, was halted at the borders of Egypt by the receipt of a great sum of money as ransom. But Yahweh cannot be turned aside from his punitive purpose by such means; *cf.* Pr. 11^{4}. This line and the following clause occur also in Ez. 7^{19}, where it is an interpolation and does not appear in 𝔊.—*In the day of the wrath of Yahweh and in the fire of his zeal, all the earth will be consumed*] This line is made up of elements appearing also in 1^{15} 3^{8}. It is probably a later expansion, interrupting as it does the close connection between the first and last lines of this verse and being identical in meaning with the latter.* The judgment here announced is probably universal, as in $1^{2.\,3}$ 3^{8}. *Cf.* Is. 28^{22}.—*For a full destruction, yea, a fearful one, will Yahweh make of all the inhabitants of the land*] *Cf.* Is. 10^{23} Je. 5^{18} 46^{28} Ez. 11^{13} 20^{17}. For the text, *v. i.*. 𝔐 may be rendered "altogether fearful" (*cf.* Dt. 16^{15} 28^{29} Is. 16^{7}); but the reading of the Vrss. is preferable. The use of the third person here furnishes insufficient warrant for treating the whole verse as a later addition,† or for changing it to the first person;‡ *v.* on v. ^{7}. The remaining considerations urged in favour of discarding the verse are of slight weight. The fact that the first line occurs also in Ez. 7^{19} proves nothing in itself as to the priority of either passage; but the structure of Ez. 7^{19} throws doubt upon the originality of that passage as it now stands. The custom of buying deliverance from an attack was so common (*cf.* 2 K. 15^{16-20} 16^{7-9} 18^{13-16})§ that it is hardly necessary to suppose that this must be an allusion to the manner in which Egypt escaped the scourge of the Scythian invasion. The claim that those who are represented as dead in v. ^{17} cannot be thought of in v. ^{18} as attempting to buy their deliverance makes no allowance for the agility of thought. The indefiniteness of our knowledge regarding the development of Hebrew eschatology is no basis for saying that the idea of a universal destruction here presented demonstrates the late origin of the passage. It is by no means certain that the destruction here contemplated is thought of as universal. The thought in vv. $^{12.\,16}$ concerns itself with Judah and Jerusalem and the language here does not forbid the same limitation of the judgment. But if, as seems probable, the thought of universality is present, such a conception is not at all out of keeping with the authorship of Zephaniah himself (*v.* Int., § 4).

---

[*] So, *e. g.*, Marti, Now.^{K}, Siev., Fag., Roth., Du., Kent.

[†] So, *e. g.*, Mau., Dl.$^{Prol., 193}$, BDB..

[‡] So van H..

[§] So We..

[**] So Ew..

[††] So, *e. g.*, Hd., Dav., GASm., Dr..

A smooth, regular and uniform metre throughout this poem can be produced only by taking undue liberties with the text. The parallelism, fortunately, is very marked and thus indicates the poetic lines clearly. The metre of the first four strs. is prevailingly pentameter or *qina.*

---

* So Marti (?). Schw. hesitates between ^{18b} and ^{18c}; Fag. om. ^{18c}; Kent om. both, Du. om. all after "zeal."

† So Marti, Now.^{K} (?), Siev..

‡ So Now.^{K} (?), Fag..

§ It was a frequent experience in the campaigns of such conquerors as Tiglath-pileser I, Shalmanezer II, Sargon and Ashurbanipal.

Through the remainder of the poem, hexameter prevails. The movement of thought from str. to str. is easily recognisable and the whole closes with a splendid climax of universal doom.

The arrangement here presented involves few textual changes that are not called for on grounds wholly independent of the poetic form. From the reconstructed poem, the following materials found in 𝔐 are lacking, viz., 1^{8a} ("and it shall be in the day of 'י's sacrifice") ^{9a} ("in that day"), ^{10a} ("and it shall be in that day, it is the oracle of י"), $^{11b.c.}$ $^{13b.e.}$ ^{18b}. The first two of these are simple prosaic introductions by some editor. The third is shown to be extraneous to the movement of thought by the interruption it occasions between ^{11b} and ^{12}, in both of which the speaker deals with Jerusalem; and also by its marked variation from the metrical movement of the context. The fourth addition ($^{13b.e}$) is betrayed by its hackneyed phraseology as well as its metrical variation. The last one (^{18b}) is plainly identical in thought with ^{18c}; but the latter makes a little closer connection with ^{18a} than ^{18b} does and, therefore, has the right of way. It is worthy of notice also that ^{18b} is practically a duplicate of 3^{8d}.

The rearrangement of vv. $^{8.9}$ here accepted was first proposed by Schw. and followed by Now. and Fag. (*cf.* Siev. who rearranges thus: vv. $^{5.8b.9b.8c.9a.10}$). The reason for the transposition is found in the excellent sense thereby secured; in the fact that v. ^{8a}, as it stands in 𝔐, lacks the necessary balancing clause, stating the cause of the judgment it announces; and in the further fact that the two clauses dealing with foreign practices are thus brought together.

7. הס] 𝔖, *fear.* Gr. adds כל בשר as in Zc. 2^{7}.—זבח] 𝔊 = זִבְחוֹ.—הקריש] 𝔖 *invited.*—**8.** ויעל בני המלך] 𝔏 om.—בני] 𝔊 = בית; so We. (?), Gr., Dav., GASm., Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, Now., van H., Fag.. For the same interchange, *cf.* Gn. 45^{11} Ex. 16^{31} Jos. 17^{17} 18^{5} 1 Ch. 2^{10} Ne. 7^{28} Je. $16^{5.14}$ Ez. 2^{3} Ho. 1^{7}. *Cf.* the use of בית in v. ^{9}.—הלבשים] Rd. הַלֹּבֵשׁ; so Schw., Now., Fag.; ם is a dittog. from the foll. word; *cf.* הדולג.—**9.** על כל הדולג על־המפתן] 𝔊$^{\text{ℵAQ}}$ 𝔖$^{\text{H}}$, *ἐπὶ πάντας ἐμφανῶς ἐπὶ τὰ πρόπυλα.* 𝔊$^{\text{B}}$ om. על כל. Σ, *ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς ἐπιβαίνοντας κ.τ.λ.*. 𝔙, *super omnem qui arroganter ingreditur super limen.* 𝔖, *upon all extortioners and spoilers.* 𝔗, *all those who walk in the laws of the Philistines.* Wkl., *AOF.*, III, 381 *ff.*, would render, "against all who mount the throne." This involves a new meaning for both words. דולג is connected by Wkl. with the Arabic *drg* and made to mean 'mount' or 'climb.' *Cf.* 2 S. 22^{30} where 'scale' furnishes an admirable meaning for the Pi'el. But 'skip,' 'dance' or 'leap' is required by Is. 35^{6} Ct. 2^{8} BS. 36^{31} and is suitable both here and in 2 S. 22^{30}. Furthermore, the meaning 'mount' or 'climb' is doubtful for the Arabic *drg*, aside from some derived stems where it is used figuratively; the ordinary usage is 'walk slowly.' מפתן is taken by Wkl. as designating primarily the pedestal upon which the image of the deity was placed (1 S. 5$^{4.5}$), and secondarily, the king's throne. The phrase as a whole would thus point to the king's advisers, those who stood upon the steps of the throne. But though this meaning of 'א would yield good sense in 1 S. 5$^{4.5}$ Ez. 9^{3} 10$^{4.18}$, it hardly suits in Ez. 46^{2} and is impossible in Ez. 47^{1}. Furthermore, neither on the numerous Babylonian and Assyrian seals nor in any known relief is a god represented as placed upon a pedestal, or a royal throne as raised upon a dais; the god and the king alike sit in a chair of state with a footstool attached.—ארניהם] 𝔊 𝔙 = ארני אלהיהם. 𝔖, *their storerooms*, an inner Syriac error of ܕ for ܪ. Better treated as sg. than as pl.; Ges.$^{\S 124 e}$. **10.** הרגים] 𝔊, *ἀποκεντούντων* = הַרֹגִים (*cf.* 2 Ch. 33^{14}) or הרגים; so 𝔖.—המשנה] 𝔊 𝔖 𝔙 = *second* (*gate*).—**11.** הילילו יושבי המכתש] Rd. וְיִלְלָה מִן הַמַּכְתֵּשׁ; so Marti, Fag. and Kent who retains יושבי.—המכתש] 𝔊, *τὴν κατακεκομμένην*. 𝔙, *pilae*. 𝔖 transliterates as a proper name. 𝔗, *by the brook Kidron*. A, Σ, *τῶν ὅλμων*. Θ, *ἐν τῷ βάθει*.—נרמה] 𝔊, *ὡμοιώθη*.—כנען] Θ, *μεταβόλων*.—נטילי] 𝔊, *οἱ ἐπηρμένοι*. 𝔏, *qui exaltantur* (*in argento et auro*). 𝔙, *involuti*. The word is *ἁπ*. and is ordinarily treated as a passive formation = "weighed down" (*cf.* עסים, משיח, שכיר); but it is better taken as active (*cf.* הסיר, קציר, פקיד); *v.* Barth, *NB.*$^{\S 125}$.—**12.** אחפש] 𝔊^{Y}, HP. 36, 51, 97, 238, have a double rendering, viz., *I will search Jerusalem with a lamp and I will visit Jerusalem with a lamp* (*and I will visit*, etc.). Marti, וַאֲחַפֵּשׂ; so Siev., Now.^{K}, Fag..—בנרות] Rd., with 𝔊 𝔖, בַּנֵּר; so Schw. (?); Marti (?), Fag., Roth., Kent. Eth., *with a lamp of wisdom*.—האנשים] Rd., with Now.^{K}, הַשַּׁאֲנַנִּים; so Fag., Kent.—הקפאים] 𝔏, *qui contemptores sunt*. 𝔙, *defixos*. 𝔖, *those despising*.—שמריהם] 𝔊, *τὰ φυλάγματα αὐτῶν*. HP. 86 mg. *βδελύγματα*. 𝔏, *ne custodiant mandata*. 𝔙, *in faecibus suis*. 𝔗, *who in tranquillity enjoy*. 'שׁ is always in the pl., *v.* Is. 25^{9} Je. 48^{11} Ps. 75^{9}. The meaning is clear, but the root uncertain. *HWB.*^{15} connects it with 'שׁ, *to keep;* may it not, however, be better traced to Assy. *šamâru*, 'to rage,' being so named as that which causes turmoil either in the process of fermentation or in the brain of the drinker?—**13.** למשסה] 𝔊, *εἰς διαρπαγήν*. 𝔙, *in direptionem*.—וישבו] 𝔊 𝔖 add *in them*.—**14.** יום יהוה] Marti suggests יומי in both cases because of the 1st pers. in v.^{17}; so Fag..—ומהר] 𝔊, *καὶ ταχεῖα*. Rd., with Schw., וּמְמַהֵר; so We., Now., Marti, Siev., Fag., Roth.. Bach., הַיּוֹם הַנּוֹרָא. 𝔐 was formerly treated as an inf., the impf. that ordinarily accompanies such a construction being understood (Ew.$^{\S 240 e}$; Hd.); but this is without analogy. For a similar case of a prtc. without initial מ, *v.* מָאֵן (Ex. 7^{27} 9^{2} 10^{4}); *cf.* Ges.$^{\S 52 s}$. *HWB.*^{15} treats it here and in Is. 8$^{1.3}$ as a verbal adj. (so Or., GASm.); but it is better here to correct the text.—קול] Kenn. 145, קרוב; so Marti, Now.^{K}, Fag., Roth.. Siev. om..—מר] Rd., with Marti, הַמַּר; so Now.^{K}, Fag., Roth. (?), Du., Kent. 𝔊, *πικρά*.—צרח שם גבור] Rd. חָשׁ מִגִּבּוֹר, dropping צר as dittog. of צרה in foll. line. This yields a text in perfect conformity with the corresponding portion of ^{14a}.

Cf. הַמַּר and הַגָּדוֹל , חָשׁ and מְמַהֵר. Note the same juxtaposition of חיש and מהר in Is. $8^{1.3}$. For other cases of vertical dittography, *cf.* 2^2 Mi. $1^{2\text{ c. }11\text{ a}}$ $2^{13\text{ b}}$ $5^{1\text{ b}}$ Ez. 1^{24-26} $7^{13\text{ f.}}$. This correction is based upon the suggestion of Müller, *SK.*, LXXX, 309 *f.*, who reads צַר חָשׁ מִגִּבּוֹר. 𝕲, *καὶ σκληρὰ τέτακται δυνατή* (δ′ being joined with v. ^{15}). 𝖁, *tribulabitur*, etc.. Gr.$^{\text{Em.}}$, יִצְרַח כַּגִּבּוֹר. Marti, גַּם (for שָׁם); so Now.$^{\text{K}}$ (?), Siev. (?), Roth. (?). צרח occurs again only in Is. 42^{13}, but this with the Assy. *ṣarâḥu*, 'cry aloud,' renders its meaning clear.—שם] Of the passages usually cited in support of a temporal sense (so here, *e. g.*, Hi., Mau., We. (?), Now. (?), *HWB.*^{15}, Du.) several are due to a corrupt text (viz., Ps. 66^6 Je. 50^9 Jb. 23^7), while in others a local sense is equally good, if not better (*e. g.*, Jb. 35^{12} Ps. 14^5 36^{13} 66^6 132^{17} 133^3 Pr. 8^{27} Ho. 10^9 Ju. 5^{11}).—**15.** צרה ומ׳] The same phrase occurs in Jb. 15^{24}; other formations from the same root are conjoined in Is. 30^6 Je. 19^9 Dt. $28^{53.55.57}$ Pr. 1^{27}. Such cases are due to the Hebrew liking for assonance.—שאה ומ׳] Also in Jb. 30^3 38^{27} BS. 51^{10}. In addition to the assonance, increased emphasis is secured by such junction of two slightly different formations from one root; *e. g.*, בוקה ומבוקה, Na. 2^{11}; שממה ומשמה, Ez. 33^{29}; תאניה ואניה, Is. 29^2; תקעו בתקוע, Ez. 6^{14}.—ערפל] Schw., on the analogy of כַּרְמֶל and אַרְאֵל (Is. 33^7), regards עֲרָפֶל as the original form; *cf.* Syr. *ʿarpelā*. Barth, *NB.* $^{§\,106\text{ b}}$, treats it as a qŭtălib form; but it is better taken with Vol., *ZA.*, XVII, 310 *f.*, as a composite noun, with אֵל used as an intensifying epithet; *cf.* Assy. *erpu* = 'cloud,' and the various usages of the Ar. equivalent which may be traced back to a primary meaning, 'cloud.' On the divine name as giving superlative significance, *v.* Kelso, *AJSL.*, XIX, 152 *ff.*; *cf.* 1 S. 14^{15}.—**17.** ליהוה] Rd. לִי.—ושפך] 𝕲, *καὶ ἐκχεεῖ*, but in HP. 36, 51, 62, 86, 95, 97, 147, 185, 228a, *ἐκχεῶ*; *cf.* 𝕷, *effundam*.—לחמם] Some mss. לְחֻמָּם, but better without dag.; *v.* Baer and Ginsburg. The meaning is wholly uncertain. Dl.$^{\text{Prol., 193}}$ derives from לחם, 'be close, firm' (so BDB.), and renders *Eingeweide*, which fits better here than 'flesh,' but is unsuitable in Jb. 20^{23}. Nö., *ZDMG.*, XL (1886), 721, suggests the meaning 'wrath,' connecting it with Syriac *lḥm*, 'to threaten'; this is fitting in Jb. 20^{33}, but wholly out of place here. The rendering 'flesh,' against which both Dl. and Nö. urge weighty objections, suits fairly well here, but is inadmissible in Jb. 20^{33}. The text there is almost certainly corrupt (*cf.* 𝕲, *ὀδύνας*) and the same difficulty may exist here. 𝕲, *τὰς σάρκας αὐτῶν*. Schw. (?) לחתו (from √ לחה), *cf.* adj. לַח. Gr.$^{\text{Em.}}$, והילם (?). Bach., וְלֵחוֹ מַיִם. Schw., וּלְחֻמָם; so Now., Marti, Roth., Du.; *cf.* Je. 11^{19}.—כגללים] 𝖁, *sicut stercora*; so 𝕾. 𝕲, *ὡς βόλβιτα*. 𝕷, *sicut stercora boum*. Bach., כַּגְּמַלִּים.—**18.** עברת יהוה . . . קנאתו] Fag. changes to 1st pers., viz. עֶבְרָתִי . . . קִנְאָתִי.—אף] Rd. אַף, with 𝕲, *καὶ* and 𝕾; so Schw., Gr.$^{\text{Em.}}$, We., GASm., Now., Marti, Hal., Dr., Du., Kent. *Cf.* 𝖁, *cum*.—נבהלה] 𝕲, *σπουδήν*. Gr.$^{\text{Em.}}$ בְּהָלָה; so Now. (?), Marti, Roth.. But this is unnecessary since the prtc. makes excellent sense and the same construction occurs in Is. 10^{23} 28^{22} Dn. 9^{27}.—כלה . . . יעשה את] The vb. takes two acc., or the first acc. is so closely welded to and identified with the vb. that the combined expression is treated as a vb. and takes an obj. in the acc.; so also Je. 5^{18} (rd. אֶתְכֶם) 30^{11} 46^{28} Ez. 11^{13} 20^{17} Ne. 9^{31}. Now.^{K} changes יעשה to אֶעֱשֶׂה.

§ 4. A DAY OF DOOM UPON PHILISTIA (2$^{1-7}$).

In a poem that has suffered many things at the hands of editors, the prophet foretells woe upon the Philistines. The reasons for the divine anger against Israel's ancient foe were apparently so well known to the prophet's audience that they did not need to be rehearsed here. The poem is composed of four strs. of two lines each. Str. I sounds the note of warning to Philistia in view of the near approach of her day of judgment (2$^{1.\ 2a}$). Str. II specifies four of the five great Philistine towns as doomed to destruction (2^{4}). Str. III announces the complete depopulation of the whole Philistine coast (2^{5}). Str. IV represents this former abode of men as given over to the pasturage of flocks (2$^{6.\ 7b}$).

ASSEMBLE yourselves, yea, assemble, O nation unabashed!
  Before ye become fine dust, like chaff which passes away.
FOR Gaza will be forsaken and Ashkelon a waste.
  As for Ashdod—at noon they will drive her out; and Ekron will be uprooted.
WOE to the inhabitants of the coast of the sea, the nation of the Cherethites;
  For I will make thee perish, without an inhabitant, O land of the Philistines.
AND thou wilt become pastures for shepherds and folds for flocks;
  By the sea will they feed; in the houses of Ashkelon at evening will they lie down.

Str. I calls upon Philistia to brace herself for the shock that awaits her.—**2^{1}.** *Assemble yourselves, yea, assemble*] This rendering is somewhat uncertain, being directly supported only by 𝔊 𝔖 𝔗 𝔙 Σ (*v. i.*). The verb does not occur elsewhere in the forms here used, but in another stem it is used of the gathering of straw and sticks. Various renderings have been proposed for it here; *e. g.*, 'end yourselves, etc.';* 'turn pale and be pale';† 'test yourselves, yea, test';‡ 'crowd and crouch down';§ 'gather yourselves firmly together and be firm';* 'purify yourselves and then purge others';† 'conform yourselves to law and be regular.'‡ But none of these finds adequate support either in the Hebrew usage of this root, or in the related dialects, or in the Vrss.. Several scholars abandon as hopeless the attempt to interpret.§ The least objectionable of the emendations proposed yields the meaning, 'get you shame and be ye ashamed'; but this is scarcely possible for two reasons: (1) it is difficult to see how so clear and easy a reading could have given way to so difficult a one as 𝔐 now offers; (2) the thought of v. ^{2} presupposes in v. ^{1} either a call to flee from the wrath to come, or to repent and so escape, or an ironical summons to prepare for the coming conflict. 'Be ashamed' seems too mild a term for this context. For the difficulty of the translation here given, *v. i.*. For similar calls to assemble in order to ward off inevitable destruction, *cf.* Jo. 1^{4} 2^{15} 3^{11} Je. 4^{5}.—*O nation unabashed!*] Here again we can attain no certainty as to the meaning. The obscurity lies in the word rendered 'unabashed.'** Among many other renderings, we may cite 'undisciplined,'†† 'unlovable,'‡‡ 'that does not desire to be converted to the law,'§§ 'that never paled (*sc.* with terror),*** 'not desired (= hated),'††† 'that hath no longing.'‡‡‡ Here again the attempt to discover the sense is abandoned by some.§§§ The Hebrew usage of this word affords no basis for any other meaning than 'not longing for,' 'not desirous of'; *cf.* Ps. 84^{2} 17^{12} Jb. 14^{15} Gn. 31^{30}. But this is too vague and indefinite in the present passage.**** The idea of 'shame' is associated with this root in Aramaic, in late Hebrew and in colloquial Arabic. This furnishes a good meaning in this place and, in default of anything better, may be adopted. The nation addressed is probably not the Jewish;†††† nor is it the pious element within the Jewish nation,‡‡‡‡ for Zephaniah would scarcely address a mere fragment of the people as 'nation.' It is rather the Philistines, against whom the bulk of this section is directed. This becomes much clearer after the secondary elements in vv. $^{1-3}$ are recognised.—**2.** *Before ye become fine dust*] The Philistines are now addressed as individuals and warned to seek some way of escape before it is too late. The figure in itself might picture either the completeness of the coming destruction (Ps. 18^{42}), or the worthlessness of the vanquished (1^{17} Zc. 9^{3}), or the wide dispersion of the stricken people. In view of the added comparison to chaff, the latter is probably the real point of the simile; *cf.* Is. 29^{5} 41^{2}. For the text upon which this translation rests, *v. i.*. 𝔐 is open to objection on the ground of serious grammatical difficulty and the inappropriateness of the terms used. A literal rendering of 𝔐 yields, "before the bringing forth of a decree," which might mean either "before a decree brings forth" (*cf.* Pr. 27^{1}), or "before a decree is brought forth." It has been variously interpreted, *e. g.*, "before the decree brings forth,"* *i. e.*, before the events befall you that are decreed by God; "before the term is born,"† *i. e.*, before the day fixed by God breaks forth from the dark womb of the future; "before the law bring forth,"‡ *i. e.*, the Mosaic law fulfilling the curse it pronounces in Dt. 31^{17}. But these all leave too much to the imagination of the interpreter.—*Like chaff that passes away*] Everywhere that reference is made to chaff, except possibly in Is. 41^{15}, it is as a simile of scattering (*e. g.*, Is. 17^{13} Ho. 13^{3} Jb. 21^{18} Ps. 1^{4}). The text of 𝔊 is here followed (*v. i.*). 𝔐 is very difficult, if not impossible. RV. renders, "before the day pass as the chaff," supplying the word 'before.' RVm. offers as an alternative, "the day passeth as the chaff," a parenthetic statement.§ But the image of chaff flying away is always applied to things that depart, not to the rapid approach of things to come, whereas the day here mentioned is evidently the coming day of judgment. The only other available meaning, viz., *tempus fugit*, is too commonplace for such exalted utterance as this and also places upon the word 'day' an abstract interpretation which it will not bear.—*Before there come upon you the burning anger of Yahweh*] Lit., "the burning of Yahweh's

---

* *E. g.*, Mau., Hd., Ke.. † Ew.. ‡ De W.. § Or..

---

* Stei..

† Fürst (*Concordance*).

‡ Van H..

§ Schw., We., Dav., GASm., Stk., Roth..

** So many interpreters, *e. g.*, Rosenm., Dav., Or., GASm., Dr., Fag..

†† 𝔊 𝔖.

‡‡ 𝔙.

§§ 𝔗.

*** Mau., Ew., Ke..

††† Hd..

‡‡‡ RVm..

§§§ *E. g.*, Schw., We., Now., Marti, Stk., Roth., Kent.

**** *Cf.* 𝔙, which retains this sense here, but puts it in the passive, whereas elsewhere it is always active.

†††† *Contra* Hd., Or., Schw., We. Dav. GASm., Marti, van H., *et al.*.

‡‡‡‡ *Contra* Dr., Stk., *et al.*.

* So, *e. g.*, Hi., Mau., Hd., RV..

† Ew..

‡ Kl..

§ So, *e. g.*, Hi., Mau., Ew., Hd..

anger," a phrase found no less than thirty-three times in the OT.. The line is best treated as a late gloss,[*] perhaps having originated after the preceding line had become unintelligible.—*Before there come upon you the day of the anger of Yahweh*] Probably only a variant of the foregoing line, being identical with it except for one word.[†]—**3.** *Seek Yahweh, all ye humble of the earth*] *Cf.* Am. 5^{6} Is. 55^{6}. The address is to the pious community of Israelites the world over. The phraseology and the ideas of this verse, together with the fact that it interrupts the close connection between v. ^{2a} and v. ^{4} and does not conform to the *qina*-rhythm of the context, show that we are dealing with a later interpolation.[‡] The phrase "humble of the earth" occurs also in Am. 8^{4} Is. 11^{4} Jb. 24^{4} Ps. 76^{10}, while the adjective 'humble' is a favourite epithet for the Israelitish community in the Psalter, *e. g.*, 147^{6} 149^{4}; for the opposite characterisation, *cf.* Ps. 75^{9}. The term as used here is distinctively religious in its significance as is shown by the defining clause which follows. This usage is characteristic of the later literature, especially the Psalms.—*Who do his ordinance*] Thereby differentiating themselves from the pagan communities around them and also from large numbers of Israelites who deliberately abandoned their own unpopular faith and became zealous adherents of the faith of their conquerors.—*Seek righteousness*] The content of the word 'righteousness' underwent a process of change in the history of Israel, the determining factor in the process being the idea of God that lay behind it. The fact that the exhortation "seek righteousness" runs parallel to the one "seek Yahweh" shows that here the two are considered identical. That is to say, he who would secure Yahweh's favour will do so by following the path of righteousness, which has already been outlined as the doing of Yahweh's ordinance.—*Seek humility*] This second route to the divine favour is clearly indicative of the late origin of the verse. The word 'humility' occurs besides only in Psalms and Proverbs.

---

[*] Om. by 𝔊$^{\aleph\, c.b.Y}$ 𝔄 HP. 95, 185, 228 marg., 233, with 6 mss. of Kenn. and 8 of de R.; so also Oort$^{Em.}$, Marti, Siev., Now.^{K}, Stk., Fag., Kent.

[†] 𝔖^{H} has it under an asterisk. It is om. by Gr.$^{Em.}$, Schw., We., Bu. (*SK.*, 1893, p. 396), Now., Marti, Hal., Dr., Siev., van H., Fag., Roth., Du., Kent.

[‡] So Schw.. Sta.^{GVI}, We.. Now., Grimm (*Lit. App.*, 84–86), Marti, BDB., Siev., Beer, Fag., Du., Kent.

It expresses the state of mind to which pious Israelites were reduced by the terrible calamities that befell them in and after the Exile. Smitten to their knees by the wrath of God, they inculcated constantly the necessity of "a broken and a contrite heart"; *cf.* Ps. 51^{17} 34^{18} Is. 57^{15} 66^{2}.—*Perchance ye may be hidden in the day of Yahweh's anger*] *Cf.* Am. 5^{15} and *v.* H.$^{\text{AH}}$, *ad loc.*. The figure is that of a storm or an invasion sweeping over the land; *cf.* Is. 26^{20} Jb. 14^{13}. The destruction will be so comprehensive and terrible that escape from it is almost inconceivable. The writer does not dare to promise certain deliverance even to the pious. Repentance and right living cannot always be depended upon to guarantee freedom from the buffetings of fortune, or the chastisements of God which seek the enrichment of character.

Str. II resumes the story of Philistia's coming destruction.—**4.** *For Gaza will be forsaken*] A threat of depopulation. *Cf.* Is. 6^{12} 7^{16}. On Gaza and the Philistines, *v.* H.$^{\text{AH, 23. 25 f.}}$.* The Hebrew words 'Gaza' and 'forsaken' furnish an assonance that cannot be carried over into English. Such a play upon words was not inconsistent with the most solemn utterance; *cf.* Mi. $1^{10\text{ ff.}}$ Ez. 25^{16}.—*And Ashkelon a waste*] The city, after acknowledging many masters in the long course of her history, was finally destroyed in 1270 A.D.†—*Ashdod—at noon they will drive her out*] The phrase "at noon" is susceptible of two interpretations. The first is based upon the fact that the heat of mid-day causes a suspension of all business in the orient; hence an attack at that time would come unexpectedly and find the city unprepared (*cf.* Je. 6^{4} 15^{8} 2 S. 4^{5} 1 K. 20^{16}).‡ The second is preferable, which finds the phrase to designate the shortness of the siege; it will be all over in half a day.§ A parallel statement occurs in an inscription of Esarhaddon, found at Sinjirli, in which he says, "Memphi, his royal city, in a half day I besieged, I captured, I destroyed, I burned with fire."** The Moabite Stone likewise says, "I fought against it from the break of day until noon, and I took it" (ll. 15, 16); *cf.* Jb. 4^{20} Is. 38^{12}. If this latter view be correct, there is probably an allusion here by way of contrast to the siege of Ashdod by Psamtik I, which is said to have lasted twenty-nine years (640–611 B.C.) and, if so, was in progress when these words were spoken.

---

* *V.* also M. A. Meyer, *History of the City of Gaza* (1907).

† *V.* GASm. *Historical Geog.* 189–93.

‡ So, *e. g.*, Mau., Hd., Schw., Now., Dr., Kent.

§ So Dav., GASm., Marti.

** *V. Ausgrabungen in Sendschirli*, I, 40 *f.*.

Hdt. is the only source of information concerning this siege of Ashdod. The length of it seems almost incredible. But the narrative of Hdt. for this period is very detailed and on the whole accurate so far as it can be tested. Not only so, but other cities are known to have undergone protracted sieges; *e. g.*, Tyre withstood Nebuchadrezzar for thirteen years, and the Hyksos defended Avaris against three or four successive rulers of Thebes. The so-called siege of Ashdod may have been a long series of intermittent hostilities, involving a more or less complete blockade of the trade routes both by land and sea.

And Ekron will be uprooted] Paronomasia is here again employed. Judgment has now been declared on four of the five great cities of Philistia. Gath is passed over in silence, by reason of the fact that it no longer existed in Zephaniah's time; *v.* H.^{AH} on Am. 6^{2}. The only later allusion to it, viz., Mi. 1^{10}, is probably of a proverbial character and does not imply the actual existence of Gath at that time.

Str. III passes from the individual towns to Philistia as a whole. —**5.** *Woe to the inhabitants of the border of the sea*] A fitting designation of Philistia, which lay along the Maritime Plain; *cf.* Is. 9^{1} Je. 47^{7} Ez. 25^{16}.—*The nation of the Cherethites*] The Philistines are thus named also in 1 S. 30^{14} Ez. 25^{16}. In Am. 9^{7} Je. 47^{4} and Dt. 2^{23} they are said to have come to Philistia from Caphtor, which is probably the Hebrew equivalent of the old Egyptian *Keftiu*, *i. e.*, Crete.

According to Hdt. (I, 173), the Philistines were the descendants of the barbarians formerly occupying Crete. Marcus Diaconus (*c.* 430 A.D.) and Stephen of Byzantium (*c.* 600 A.D.) relate that Zeus Cretagenes was worshipped in Gaza and that the city was originally called Minoa, after Minos, king of Crete, who had led an expedition to the mainland and given this city his name. Recent discovery of Cretan pottery at Gaza at least establishes the fact of intercourse between Crete and the Philistines; though, of course, the presence of ancient Cretan settlements at Gaza is not proved thereby. The dominance of Minoan civilisation around the Mediterranean littoral and the indisputable evidence of steady contact between the dwellers on the Nile and the inhabitants of the northern islands from very early times combine with the foregoing facts to make it in the highest degree probable that the Philistines were immigrants into western Asia from Crete and the neighbouring isles (*Cf.* Evans, *Cretan Pictographs*, 100 *ff.*; J. H. Breasted, *History of Egypt*, 261, 338, 477 *f.*; G. F. Moore, *EB.* 3715 *f.*; W. Max Müller, *Asien und Europa*, 337, 387 *ff.*; Schw. *ZwTh.* XXXIV, 103 *f.*, 255.) This probability is converted into practical certainty by the recent discovery of the so-called Phaestos Disk in Crete. Upon it there appears as one of the common signs the familiar and characteristic Philistine head-dress as known to us already from the Egyptian monuments. The exact place of the origin of the disk is uncertain, whether in Crete itself, or in some neighbouring isle, or on the adjacent coast lands of Asia Minor. But, in any case, it reveals the influence of the Cretan civilisation and may with confidence be assigned to some region in the vicinity of Crete where the Philistines were residents. While the exact period to which it belongs is uncertain, it is quite clear that it antedates the emigration of the Philistines to Palestine. *V.* L. Pernier, in *Ausonia, Rivista d. società Ital. di archeologia e Storia dell' arte*, III (1909), 255 *ff.*; Ed. Meyer, in *Sitzungsberichte der Königl. Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften* (*Phil.-hist. Classe*), XLI (1909), 1022 *ff.*; von Lichtenberg, *Einflüsse der ägäischen Kultur auf Aegypten und Palästina* (1911), 18–22, 66 *f.*; and especially, Evans, *Scripta Minoa*, I (1909), 22–28, 273–293. An unsuccessful attempt has recently been made by George Hempl to interpret it as a Greek ins.; *v. Harper's Magazine*, January, 1911.

David's body-guard was composed of Cherethites and Pelethites (2 S. 8^{18} 15^{18} $20^{7.\ 23}$ 1 K. $1^{38.\ 44}$ 1 Ch. 18^{17}), terms probably reflecting a twofold source of the Philistine nation.—*The word of Yahweh against you*] This is best treated as a marginal note by some editor or reader.* Its presence mars the metrical form.—*O Canaan*] A further gloss,† going with the following "land of the Philistines," rather than with the immediately preceding phrase. In the Egyptian inscriptions, the name Canaan is applied to any part of the land of Palestine; but nowhere else in the OT. does it denote Philistia alone; *cf.*, however, Jos. 13^3 Nu. 13^{29} Ju. 3^3. Here it may have been used as an opprobrious epithet, stigmatising the Philistines as rascally traders.—*For I will bring about thy ruin, so that there will be no inhabitant, O land of the Philistines*] This involves a transposition* of the last clause, "O land, etc.," from the place it holds in 𝔐, which is immediately before "I will bring, etc.." This is made necessary by the structure of the *qina*-line, which calls for the shorter part after the cæsura. The phrase "without an inhabitant" is a favourite one in Je., *e. g.*, $4^{7.\ 29}$ 9^{11} 26^{9} 33^{10} 34^{22} 46^{19} 48^{9} 51^{29}. That it is not to be taken too literally is shown by Je. 44^{22}.

---

* So Marti, Siev., Fag..

† So We., Preuschen (*ZAW.* XV, 32), GASm. (?), Now., Wkl. (*AOF.* III, 232 *f.*), Marti, Siev., Fag., Stk., Du., Kent.

The fourth and last str. adds picturesqueness of detail to the announcement of Philistia's devastation.—**6.** *And thou wilt become pastures for shepherds*] RV. renders, "and the sea-coast shall be pastures, with cottages for shepherds." But this involves the difficulty of treating 'sea-coast' as a feminine noun, while it is masculine everywhere else, even in v. ^{7}. It is better to treat it as a case of vertical dittography from v. ^{7}. The word 'pastures' too is in an almost impossible construction in 𝔐. RV.'s 'cottages' are without solid foundation; a better rendering for the word is 'cisterns' or 'wells,' or even 'caves,' as in RVm.. But a simpler way out of the difficulty is to regard the word, which occurs only here, as a corrupt dittograph of the immediately preceding word, which it so closely resembles. Another treatment of the word is suggested by 𝔊, which interprets it as 'Crete'; this in itself is quite possible; but, if adopted, the words 'Crete' and 'pastures' must exchange places, the former becoming the subject of the verb, viz., "And Crete, the border of the sea, will become pastures."† With the omission of "border of the sea" suggested above, this latter interpretation becomes very attractive;‡ but it is hardly convincing because it is not likely that Philistia was known as 'Crete' in Zephaniah's time and was yet so named only once in the OT.. The line is smoother with the word omitted as in 𝔙. For "pastures for shepherds," *cf.* Am. 1^{2} Ps. 83^{13}.—*And folds for flocks*] A picture of complete depopulation, crowded towns and villages giving place to pastoral solitudes. At this point a later editor, zealous for the pre-eminence of Judah, has inserted a line safeguarding the interests of his people.—**7a.** *And the border of the sea will belong to the remnant of the house of Judah*] The late origin* of this line is shown by the way in which it breaks the close connection between v. ^{6} and v. ^{7b}; the 'they' of ^{7b} goes back for its antecedent, not to the 'remnant' of ^{7a}, but to the 'flocks' of v. ^{6}. Then, too, the use of the word 'remnant' presupposes at least the first deportation as having occurred. The same hatred of the nations in general and of the Philistines in particular is manifested here as in 2^{9} Ob. $^{19\,f.}$ Zc. $9^{5\,ff.}$ Am. 9^{12} Is. 11^{14} Je. 49^{2}, all of which are of exilic or postexilic origin.—**7b.** *By the sea will they feed; in the houses of Ashkelon at evening they will lie down*] The original poem is here resumed and finished. The closing scene shows the former marts of trade and busy hives of men given over to the undisturbed possession of well-fed sheep, going in and out of the vacant houses at will, "with none to make them afraid." The *qina*-rhythm would be restored by the transposition of the first clause 'by the sea, etc.,' to the end of the line;† but the order of thought is more natural as in 𝔐. The first clause in 𝔐 reads, "upon them will they feed"; the antecedent of 'them' can only be the 'pastures' of v. ^{6}; but this is to make a masculine suffix refer to a feminine antecedent. Hence, in part, the general adoption of the reading "by the sea," which involves only a very slight change of 𝔐. Those holding to the integrity of the verse as a whole have felt compelled to make the verbs 'feed' and 'lie down' find their subjects in the Jews themselves (*cf.* 3^{13} Is. 14^{30} Ez. 34^{14} Jb. 11^{19}), rather than in the flocks or the nomad shepherds of these flocks. But this is a forced exegesis which, with the removal of v. ^{7a} now keeping ^{7b} and ^{6} so far apart, becomes unnecessary. As between the shepherds and the flocks, the latter furnishes the more natural subject for the verbs. The objection usually urged, viz., that the prophet would not represent flocks as occupying the vacant houses, is not well taken; in no more effective way than this could he have represented the desolate and deserted state of the once populous region. The various attempts to emend the latter part of this line (*v. i.*) seem wholly unnecessary.*—*For Yahweh, their God, will visit them and turn their captivity*] This line belongs with v. $^{7\text{a}}$ and completes the editorial addition.† It clearly refers to the remnant of Judah and presupposes the exile. The reference to Judah here introduces a foreign element into a context which is concerned entirely with the Philistines. 'Visit,' frequently used of Yahweh's punitive activity, here denotes the exercise of his forgiveness and mercy. The promise of return from exile hardly accords with the view presented by the writer of v. ^{3}, who contemplates the possibility of Judah's pious ones escaping from the approaching calamity. For the phrase 'turn their captivity,' *v.* H.$^{\text{AH, 199 f. 292}}$. The alternative rendering 'turn their fortune' is less definite and forceful here.‡

---

* So Now., Marti, van H., Fag.. Wkl. (*l. c.*) om. as a gloss. Du. om. "I destroy you that there will be no inhabitant."

† So Wkl. (*AOF.* III, 232), van H.. Wkl. sets vv.$^{5.\ 6}$ apart as a separate oracle, directed not against the Philistines, but the islanders of Crete itself. The occurrence of the forms כרת and כרתים is too slight a basis for so novel an hypothesis.

‡ So We., GASm., Now., Dr. (?). *Cf.* Or.'s rendering, "shall become pastures for shepherds, and the land of Crete sheepfolds."

---

* So We., Wkl. (*l. c.*), Marti, Siev., Beer, van H., Fag., Stk., Du., Kent.

† So Now., Marti, Kent. Du. treats it as a part of the interpolated matter.

The opening str. of this oracle is in tetrameter; the remaining three take on the *qina*-rhythm. The alien elements betray their character by their failure to conform to either of these measures.

Vv. $^{2\text{b. c. 3. 7a. c}}$ are omitted from the reconstructed poem as later accretions. Vv. $^{2\text{b. c}}$ are variants of a gloss explaining the figurative language of $^{2\text{a}}$. It is impossible to say which line presents the gloss in its original form. The late origin of v. ^{3} is shown by its conception of religion and by the fact that it evidently addresses itself to the Israelites, whereas the context is concerned with the Philistines. The same objection applies to v. $^{7\text{a. c}}$. Indeed, on the strength of vv. $^{3.\ 7}$, this whole section is denied to Zephaniah by Schw., while Sta.$^{\text{GVI}}$, 645, athetizes vv. $^{1\text{-}3}$ and Bu. (*SK.* 1893, pp. 394 *ff.*, and *Gesch.* 89), vv. $^{4\text{-}7}$ (so also Kent). The argument against vv. $^{4\text{-}7}$ is that whereas in the genuine material Israel is represented as having done wrong and is therefore threatened with punishment, here Israel has been wronged by the nations and it is they that are to be punished. This, however, is not true of vv. $^{4\text{-}7}$, for not a word occurs in them charging Philistia with having injured Judah. The same kind of argument would also eliminate Am. 1$^{3\text{-}5.\ 6\text{-}8.\ 13\text{-}15}$ 2$^{1\text{-}3}$, which are quite generally accepted as genuine. Just as Amos believed that Philistia would suffer in the general destruction about to be wrought either by the people of Urartu or by the Assyrians, so Zephaniah includes her in the universal devastation he anticipates. The prophets were men of broad vision, not limited in their range of interest and observation by a provincial horizon. They saw the history of their own people against the background of world-history. Not one of them looked upon his nation as a thing apart from the world's life. Amos, Jeremiah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Ezekiel and others prophesied the downfall of nations other than Israel. Zephaniah cannot be denied prophecies of the same sort, unless there be other evidence against them than the simple fact that they are directed against non-Israelites. What the relations between Philistia and Judah were in the days of Josiah we do not know, nor does Zephaniah tell us anything upon that subject, unless 1^9 be an allusion to Philistine influence. But if Zephaniah looked for disaster to overwhelm the whole of western Asia, no special cause would be needed for a threat hurled against the Philistines.

---

* There is no good reason for including this line with the rest of the verse as a late addition, as is done by Wkl., Marti, van H..

† So We., Preuschen, Now., Wkl., Marti, Dr., Siev., van H., Fag., Stk., Du., Kent.

‡ On the origin and meaning of the phrase, *v.* Preuschen, *ZAW.* XV, 1–74.

The argument for treating vv. $^{1-3}$ as the conclusion of ch. 1 is unconvincing (*contra* Hi., GASm., Bu., *et al.*). The first chapter is complete as it stands. Moreover, the כי of 2^4 needs some antecedent material as a basis and this is supplied by $2^{1\,f.}$. The chief reason for combining vv. $^{1-3}$ with the preceding rather than the following context lies in the extraneous material incorporated in this section which makes close connection with vv. $^{4\,ff.}$ difficult. The treatment of this material as late removes this difficulty.

1. התקוששו וקושו] 𝔊, *συνάχθητε καὶ συνδέθητε*; so 𝔖. 𝔊$^{ℵ\,c.\,a.}$ HP. 62, 86, 95, 147, 185 have the variant, *συνδεήθητε*. Σ, *συλλέγητε σύνετε* (probably an error for *σύνιτε*). 𝔙, *convenite congregamini*. Many mss. have וָקֹשׁוּ, without ו, which is the normal writing of this form; *v.* Baer. Che. (*Proph. of Is.* on Is. 29^9; but abandoned in *CB.*), התבוששו ובושו; so Gr., Bu. (*SK.* LXVI, 396), BDB., Now.^{K}, Dr., Fag., Bew. (*JBL.* XXVII, 165), Kent. Hal. הִתְאוֹשְׁשׁוּ וָחֹשׁוּ. Siev. קושו והתקוששו. Another suggestion is אַל תִּתְקוֹשְׁשׁוּ קָשׁוּ, deriving ת׳ from √ קשׁשׁ 'be hard' and ק׳ from √ קשׁה. Van H. הִתְקַשְּׁשׁוּ וְקָשׁוּ (or וְקִישׁוּ). Both of the forms in 𝔐 are ἁπ'. For similar combinations of Qal and Hithpo., *v.* Is. 29^9 Hb. 1^5. The derivation of the vb. remains doubtful. Some would make it a denominative from קַשׁ, 'stubble,' meaning 'to gather stubble, sticks, etc.'; but when so used the obj. קש, תבן or עצים always accompanies it, —a fact which seems to point to the vb. itself as having only the simple meaning 'collect,' 'gather.' In any case, the vb. cannot be here used denominatively. Van H.'s reading connects it with √ קושׁ or קישׁ, corresponding to the Arabic قاس = 'mensuravit'; but the resulting sense is hardly satisfactory enough to warrant the necessary change in pointing involved. Mau. attaches it to קושׁ (= Arabic قوس) and renders 'bend yourselves'; but no such vb. occurs in Heb. and the Arabic vb., as Dav. points out, is a denominative, meaning not 'bend' but 'be bow-shaped' or 'be curved in the back.' Stei. suggests √ קשׁשׁ, connected with קָשָׁה, 'be hard.' Ew. proposes the Aram. √ קשׁשׁ = 'be old,' with a supposed primary meaning 'be withered,' and renders 'turn pale.' But none of these is more than a barren conjecture, providing no suitable meaning.—לא נכסף] 𝔊 τὸ ἀπαίδευτον; so 𝔖. 𝔙 *non amabilis*. Van H., foll. 𝔊, לֹא נוֹסָר. Schw. לֹא בְכֶסֶף. Bew. (*l. c.*), לֹא נָכָף (√ כפף). The most plausible explanation of 𝔐 is suggested by GASm., viz. Arabic *ksf* in classical speech = 'cut a thread' or 'eclipse the sun'; but in the colloquial, 'to rebuff,' 'disappoint,' 'put to shame'; in forms IV and VIII it means 'be disappointed,' 'shy,' or 'timid' (*v.* Spiro's *Arabic-English Vocabulary*). This meaning as possible for the Heb. is supported by the Aram. √ which means 'lose colour,' 'be ashamed' (*v.* Jerusalem Targum on Nu. 12^{14} Ps. 35^{4} 69^{7}). Barth, *Etymologische Studien*, 61, derives it less easily from an Arabic *ksf* = 'be oppressed,' 'afflicted.'—**2.** לדת חק] Rd. תִּהְיוּ לְדַק, tr. the letters הת (with a slight change in the second) to precede לד. For similar transpositions, *cf.* Am. 3^{12}, ברל for לבד; Ho. 5^{2}, ואני for ויאן; 7^{8} ישמחו for ימשחו; 10^{9}, עלוה for עולה; 13$^{10.\,14}$, אהי for איה. This reading accounts for all the elements in 𝔐, does away with the rare usage of an inf. cstr. with טרם (found besides only in Hg. 2^{15}), finds an exact parallel in Is. 29^{5} (*cf.* 40^{15}), is possibly supported in part by 𝔊 𝔖 (*v. i.*), and yields a line of the right length and structure. 𝔊 τοῦ γενέσθαι ὑμᾶς; similarly 𝔖 ܠܐ ܬܗܘܘܢ. Gr. (*Monatsschrift*, 1887, p. 506), לא תהיה. Schw. תִּנָּדְפוּ. We. לא תִהְיוּ; so GASm., Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, Or., *CB.*, Now., Marti, Hal., Dr., Siev. (adding כְּקַשׁ), Fag. (om. לא), Roth., Du., Kent. But (1) this involves the introduction into classical Heb. of the usage בטרם לא, not found otherwise except in the late gloss upon this passage, which immediately follows; (2) it does not satisfactorily account for either the ד or the ק of 𝔐; (3) it yields a line shorter than the measure set by the context; and (4) it is by no means certain that it represents the text that lay before 𝔊, for the inf. construction of 𝔊 suggests 𝔐 in its present form in that γενέσθαι might easily be the rendering of לדת in such a difficult context. The corruption may easily antedate 𝔊. Bew. (*l. c.*), כְּלוֹת חק = '(before) the appointed time is at an end.' Bu. (*SK.*, 1893, p. 396), מְלֹאת חֻקְּכֶם (using first letters of כמוץ).—כמוץ וגו'] 𝔊 ὡς ἄνθος = כְּנֵץ or כְּצִץ. Bew. (*l. c.*), כִּי מֵאִין לַעֲבֹר יום. The only possible rendering of 𝔐 in this context is, "like chaff a day has passed away"; but this is altogether pointless.—עבר] 𝔊 = עֹבֵר; so 𝔖 𝔙 𝔖$^{\text{H}}$; also Gr., We., GASm., Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, Or., *CB.*, Now., Marti, Dr., Siev., Fag., Roth., Du.. Bu. וְיַעֲבֹר. Van H עֳבָרָה. Hal. (using foll. יום) עֹבְרִים.—יום] 𝔖 𝔏 𝔊$^{\text{B.א.A.Q}}$ HP. 48, 233 om.; so Schw., Gr., We., Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, *CB.*, Now., Marti, Dr., Siev., van H., Du.. 𝔖$^{\text{H}}$ has it under asterisk. 𝔐 is supported by 𝔊$^{\text{Y}}$ HP. 22, 36, 40, 42, 51, 62, 68, 86, 87, 91, 95, 97, 114, 147, 153, 185, 228, 238, 240.—בטרם לא] Explicable only as a strengthened negative, Ges.$^{\S\,152\,y}$; nowhere else in the list of fifty-one occurrences of ט' is a second negative employed with it. The accumulation of particles is characteristic of late Heb..—חרון

אף] 𝔊 *ὀργὴν*, apparently om. אף; so 𝔖. Fag. substitutes יום of the preceding clause of 𝔐 for ח׳.—יום אף] HP. 86, 147, 228 = יום הרון אף.

3. ענוי] Kenn. 139, 251 עמי; *cf.* Ehr., עַמֵּי; so Fag..—אשר] 𝔊 om. and renders פ׳ as imv.; so 𝔖; but this is scarcely in accord with the position of פ׳.—פעלו] Gr., תּוֹחִילוּ.—משפטו] 𝔊 *κρίμα*. Σ adds *αὐτοῦ* under asterisk.—בקשו צדק] 𝔊^{Y} *καὶ δικαιοσύνην πραοτ. . . .* HP. 36, 97, 228 marg. om..—בקשו ענוה] 𝔊 *καὶ ἀποκρίνεσθε αὐτά* = וַעֲנוּהָ. HP. 22, 51, 62, 86, 95, 147, 185, 240 support 𝔐.—אם י׳] Marti אַפּוֹ, om. י׳; so Siev..—**4.** עזובה] 𝔊 *διηρπασμένη*. HP. 62, 147 *διεσπασμένη*; 86, 95, 185 *διεσπαρμένη*. Aq. Σ Θ *ἐγκαταλελειμένη*.—יגרשוה] 𝔊 *ἐκριφήσεται* = תגרש; so Schw.. Kenn. 30, 89 יגרשה. Gr. יְשֻׁדְּדוּהָ. Bacher (*ZAW.* XI, 185 *f.*), foll. Abulwalid Merwân ibn Ganâḥ, יִירְשׁוּהָ. Schw. (*ZAW.* XI, 260 *f.*), יְעָֽרְשׁוּהָ.—**5.** חבל] Wkl. *AOF.* III, 232 *f.*. קבל; *cf.* Assy. *ina kabal tamtim.* Only here and in v. ^{6} is ח׳ used with ים; elsewhere it is חף הים, *e. g.* Dt. 1^{7} Je. 47^{7}.—גוי] 𝔊 *πάροικοι* = גָּרֵי. Siev. הוי.—כרתים] 𝔊 *Κρητων*. Aq. Σ Θ E′ 𝔙 all treat it as a common noun and connect it with √ כרת, ‘cut,’ *e. g.* ‘destroyers,’ ‘destruction,’ etc.. Ed. Meyer, *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*, 221, suggests the possibility of this and כרי being survivals of the name ‘Zakkari’ borne by allies and kinsmen of the Philistines in the twelfth century B.C.; so also Che. *EB.* 699 *f.*. But the total loss of an initial consonant from a form with a doubled middle radical is very improbable and without parallel.—עליכם] Schw. עָלַיִךְ; so We., Preuschen (*ZAW.* XV, 32), GASm., Now., Stk., Kent. But the address is in reality to the Philistines as a people rather than to the land.—כנען] Bew. (*l. c.*), כִּי נֻעֲנָה, ‘for will be afflicted.’—ארץ] 𝔖 = וארץ.—והאבדתיך] 𝔊 = ־כֶם—; but, as Schw. has shown, מאין י׳ always foll. a local designation, never a personal one; hence 𝔐 is preferable. Siev. om. ו. Now. וְהֶאֱבִידֵךְ. Bew. והאברתיה (?).—מאין] An intensified negative in a circumstantial clause expressing result.

6. והיתה] Rd. וְהָיִת; so Sta. (in SS.), Marti, Now.^{K}, Fag., Roth., Du., Kent. Oort$^{Em.}$ והיה. Siev. וְהִכְרַתִּי. Bach. would derive from Aram. אתה and make it = ובאה; but this conjecture has no redeeming features. ה׳ might be retained as referring, with a change of person, to the foregoing ארץ פ׳; but the change of text is simpler.—חבל הים] Om. as a correction of ח׳ in v. ^{7}; so 𝔊 and Schw., We., Sta., Preuschen (*l. c.*), Dav., GASm., Now., Marti, Siev., van H., Dr., Fag., Stk., Roth., Du., Kent. Aq. *τὸ σχοινίσμα τῆς ὡραιότητος.* Σ. *τὸ περίμετρον* [*ἢ*] *τὸ παράλιον.* Bach. חֶרֶב היונה.—נְוֹת] 𝔊 *νομὴ*. 𝔙 *requies.* Now. נִוַת. Dr. נְוֵה; so Fag.. As here written, the form is *ἅπ.*; elsewhere נְאוֹת. If 𝔐 is correct, the form furnishes a significant hint as to the force of ו in pronunciation (Schw.). An analogous exchange between א and י is well known in Aram.; *cf. e. g.* דארין and דירין (Dn. 2^{28}) and באב for ביב in Elephantine Papyri, C, 2 (Sayce and Cowley). The syntax here, with נ׳ as the first of two cstrs. both defined directly by רעים is difficult. נ׳

is not a simple predicate (there being no case in OT. of a plural pred. connected with a sg. subj. by the copula), but an acc. after a vb. of becoming, היה here being equivalent to היה לְ (Schw.).—כרת] Om. with 𝔙 as a variant of נות; so Böhme (*ZAW*. VII, 212), Schw., SS., Gr., Dav., Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, Marti, Siev., Dr. (?), Now.^{K}, Fag., Roth., Du., Kent. 𝔊 Κρήτη; so 𝔖. Bach. וְהִכְּרֹת (for 'כ 'נ). Ew. derives 'כ from Ar., *wkr*, going over into *wkn*, whence קֵן = 'nest'; hence 'כ = 'huts,' 'cots' (so GASm., Kent). But every step of this process is at fault. To take only the last—קן has no connection with *wakana*, but comes from קנן, which in Assy. = 'coil,' 'curl up' (*v.* Johnston, *JAOS*. XXIX, 224 *ff.*). The usual derivation of 'כ is from כרה 'dig'; but since vb. is common (15 occurrences), it would be strange that this should be the only occurrence of the noun. Hi., foll. by Hal., traces it to כר = 'pasture' (*cf.* Assy. *kirû* = 'grove'), but the pl. of כר is כרים (Ps. 37^{20}).—**7.** חבל] Rd. חבל הים, as in v.^{6}, with 𝔊 𝔖; so We., Preuschen (*ZAW*. XV, 32), Wkl. (*AOF*. III, 232 *f.*), Now., Marti, Dr., van H., Roth., Fag., Du.. 𝔖^{H} supplies הים under asterisk. Gr. גְבוּל (?). Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$ om.. Schw. suggests om. and reading והיתה for והיה. The absence of the art. points to the cstr. with הים om. by error. 𝔐 can only be rendered, "and it shall be a portion for the remnant, etc.," the subj. being the 'ה of v.^{6}, there treated as fem., but here as masc..—עליהם] Rd. עַל הַיָּם; so We., Preuschen, GASm., Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, Now., Marti, Dr., Siev., Or., Stk., Roth., Kent. Bach. עֲגָלִים. Van H. עָלָיו הֵם. Now. and Marti tr. 'על הים ו and 'בבתי וגו.—'בבתי אשקלון בערב יר] 𝔊 adds ἀπὸ προσώπου υἱῶν Ἰούδα; so 𝔖^{H} but with Ιουδα under asterisk. 𝔊^{A} has the added phrase, but under an obelus; HP. 133, om. all of it. GASm. supposes 𝔊 to represent a remnant of a lost line. For בערב, Schw. suggests בעקרון; Gr. בְּבְּעָרִם (?); *CB*., בַּעֲרָב. Marti om. אשקלון as a later addition and reads, בְּהֶרְבוֹת 'עָרַיִךְ וגו or בְּהָרְבוֹתַיִךְ; so Now.^{K}. Siev. om. 'בבתי א and adds עֲדָרַיִךְ after 'יר. Fag. om. 'א and reads בבתים.—שבותם] Qr. = שְׁבִיתָם; so the standard text in Nu. 21^{29} and perhaps Ez. 16^{53}; elsewhere י. is offered as Kt. in eleven passages (with ו as Qr.) and as Qr. in three passages (with ו as Kt.). The frequency of the acc. cog. in Heb. favours a derivation from שוב rather than שבה; but an acc. of similar sound may be chosen for the sake of assonance where there can be no thought of an acc. cog.; *e. g.* Ps. 107^{11}, הִמְרוּ אִמְרֵי; Nu. 24^{18}, חִצָּיו יִמְחָץ; Is. 2$^{19.\ 21}$, לַעֲרֹץ הָאָרֶץ; Ez. 17^{20}, וּפָרַשְׂתִּי רִשְׁתִּי.

§ 5. THE DIVINE VENGEANCE UPON MOAB AND AMMON (2^{8-11}).

In a single str. of six lines, the attitude of Moab and Ammon toward Judah in her calamity is recalled and the dire destruction of both people is foretold (vv. $^{8.\ 9}$). Later hands have expanded the oracle and made it foretell the world-wide dominion of Yahweh (vv. $^{10-11}$). The entire section belongs to the postexilic age.

I HAVE heard the reproach of Moab and the revilings of the children of Ammon,
Wherewith they have cast reproach upon my people and vaunted themselves against their border.
Therefore, as I live—it is the oracle of Yahweh of hosts, the God of Israel—
Surely, Moab shall become like Sodom and the children of Ammon like Gomorrah,
A land overrun by weeds and salt-pits and a desolation for ever.
The remnant of my people shall prey upon them and the remainder of my nation shall take possession of them.

The oracle against Moab finds parallels in Am. 2^{1-3} Is. 15, 16 Je. 48 Ez. $25^{8\text{ ff.}}$ and that against Ammon in Am. 1^{13-15} Je. 49^{1-6} Ez. 25^{1-7}; but they are coupled together as partners in sin only here.—**8.** *I have heard*] Yahweh speaks. Perhaps the language here was suggested by Is. 16^6 (*cf.* 37^4); but there is not the slightest ground for supposing the whole oracle to have been borrowed from Isaiah and Amos.*—*The reproach of Moab and the revilings of the Ammonites*] The taunts meant are probably those resented in Ez. $25^{3.\ 6.\ 8}$ Je. $48^{26.\ 30}$. The fall of Jerusalem furnished occasion for all the foes of Judah to exult over her and apparently they did not fail to improve the opportunity to the full; *cf.* Ez. 35^{12} Ob. ^{12}. The conduct of Moab toward Israel had been characterised by insolence and arrogance on at least one occasion in the early history (2 S. 10^4, *cf.* Is. 25^{11}). Tradition and history doubtless treasured many other recollections of indignities and hostilities endured by Israel at the hands of her neighbours on the east; *cf.* Ju. 3^{12-30} $11^{4-9.\ 30-36}$ 12^{1-3} 1 S. 11, 14^{47} 2 S. $8^{1.\ 2.\ 12}$ 10–12, 2 K. $3^{1\text{ ff.}}$ 13^{20} 24^2 Am. 1^{13-15} 2^{1-3} 2 Ch. 20^1 26^8 27^5 Je. $49^{1\text{ ff.}}$. But it is absurd to attribute the prophet's anger here to the offences recorded in Nu. 22–25.* The prophets were too vitally concerned with the problems of their own age to be harbouring resentment or threatening chastisement upon foreigners for crimes that had been outlawed for centuries.—*Wherewith they have reproached my people and vaunted themselves against their border*] This spirit of revenge for injuries done to Judah is in marked contrast with the broad, humanitarian feeling of Amos, whose denunciations of foreign nations were based primarily upon their excessive cruelty in the violation of great human laws and customs, rather than upon the mere fact that they had injured the prophet's own people (*cf.* Am. $1^{3.\ 6.\ 13}$ 2^{1}). The latter half of this line is somewhat ambiguous and has been subjected to various interpretations. A common view has seen in it a charge that these foes have sought to enlarge their own territory at the expense of Israel and Judah† (*cf.* Am. 1^{13} Is. $15^{4\ \mathrm{ff.}}$ and the Meša stone). The verb is better taken, however, in the sense 'enlarge the mouth,' *i. e.* boast, taunt (*cf.* Ez. 35^{13} Ob. ^{12} Is. 37^{23}) at the expense of Judah.‡ This is the meaning called for by the parallelism, by the interpretative gloss in v. ^{10} and by the use of the same idiom elsewhere, viz. Jb. 19^{5} Ps. 35^{26} 38^{16} 55^{12}. The fact that elsewhere the idiom is always connected with persons is not sufficient reason for doubting the suitability of 'border' as an object here, for the number of its occurrences is too small to afford a basis for a general rule.§ Mal. 1^{5} shows that the idiom is susceptible of wider usage.

---

* *Contra* de W., Ew..

9. *Therefore, as I live—it is the oracle of Yahweh of hosts, God of Israel*] "Since he could swear by none greater, he sware by himself" (Heb. 6^{13}). The doom of Moab and Ammon is announced in the most solemnly impressive terms.—*Surely, Moab shall become like Sodom and the Ammonites like Gomorrah*] A simile suggesting at the same time the depth of their depravity and a sudden, awful and total destruction through the outpouring of Yahweh's wrath. The fate of these cities is constantly referred to in both OT. and NT. as furnishing a fearful example, *e. g.* Dt. 29^{23} Is. 1^{9} 13^{19} Je. 23^{14} 49^{18} 50^{40} Lam. 4^{6} Am. 4^{11} Mt. 10^{15} Lk. 10^{12} Rom. 9^{29} 2 Pet. 2^{6}.—*A land abounding in weeds*] These two Hebrew words are obscure in meaning (*v. i.*). The first one is found nowhere else in Hebrew, nor is any light thrown upon it by the Vrss. or the cognate languages. The second is found in Pr. 24^{31} Jb. 30^{7}; from the first reference it is clear that weeds in general or of some special variety are meant, while the second requires some kind of a shrub or bush or a species of weed tall and thick enough to furnish concealment for a man. With that for a starting-point, we can conjecture the meaning of the first word as 'a place overgrown' or something of the kind.—*And salt-pits*] This picture of desolation is suggested by the region about the Dead Sea, where the ground is covered with incrustations of salt; *cf.* Ez. 47^{11}. Salt is frequently employed in OT. as a symbol of sterility and ruin (Dt. 29^{23} Je. 17^{6} Jb. 39^{6} Ps. 107^{34}). The Hebrew word is in the singular number here and, unless used collectively, would mean that the entire land is to become a salt-pit. The reference may be either to pits into which the waters of the Dead Sea are admitted in order that they may evaporate, leaving their deposit of salt, or to salt-mines such as are found along the south-western shore of the Sea, where the Jebel Usdum, the base of which is a ridge of rock-salt, *c.* 200 feet in height, extends for five miles. *Cf.* Lynch's description of the north-western shore. "The scene was one of unmixed desolation. . . . Except the cane-brakes, clustering along the marshy stream which disfigured, while it sustained them, there was no vegetation whatever; barren mountains, fragments of rock, blackened by sulphureous deposit, and an unnatural sea, with low, dead trees upon its margin, all within the scope of our vision bore a sad and sombre aspect. We had never before beheld such desolate hills, such calcined barrenness." *—*And a desolation for ever*] This adds the finishing touch—the ruin is for all time.—*The remnant of my people shall spoil them and the remainder of my nation shall take possession of them*] This step is not conceived of as following the destructive scene just portrayed, but rather as simultaneous with and supplementary to it. The reference now is to the peoples themselves rather than their land. Judah, so long a sufferer at their hands, will in the great day to come strip them of all they possess and reduce them to servitude; *cf.* Is. 14^2 61^5.* This seems a more natural interpretation than that which makes the suffix refer to the lands in question and explains the apparent inconsistency of plundering and possessing a wasted wilderness as due to the idealistic character of the prophetic utterance.†

---

* *Contra* van H..

† So Hi., Mau., Or., Dav., Now., Dr..

‡ So Schw., GASm., Marti.

§ *Contra* We..

---

* *Narrative of the United States' Expedition to the River Jordan and the Dead Sea* (1849), 275.

10. *This will be their lot in return for their arrogance, because they cast reproach and vaunted themselves against the people of Yahweh of hosts*] This is a supplementary gloss.‡ It is an application of the *lex talionis* on a large scale; *cf.* Ob. $^{15\text{ f.}}$. The height of the offence of these nations is that they have dared to set themselves against Israel's God; *cf.* Je. $48^{26.\ 42}$ 1 S. $17^{26.\ 36.\ 45}$. The pride of Moab was evidently a prominent national characteristic; *cf.* Is. 16^6 Je. 48^{29}.—**11.** *Yahweh will be terrible against them*] For a similar conception of Yahweh's awe-inspiring might, *cf.* Ps. 66^5 89^7 96^4 Mal. 1^{14}. In its present position, the suffix must refer to the two nations denounced in vv. $^{8.\ 9}$. Some interpreters consider the verse out of its place,§ but it is better handled as a later addition to this context.** The preposition may be rendered either "over them," *i. e.* in judgment, or "against them," *i. e.* in attack. 𝔊's reading, "Yahweh will appear over them," is attractive, but not sufficiently so to displace 𝔐.—*For he will make lean all the gods of the earth*] Here the poor connection with the oracle on Moab and Ammon is revealed. The terror exercised over those two nations hardly finds a satisfactory origin in the fact that Yahweh destroys the gods of other peoples. The language used does not necessarily imply the writer's belief in the reality of the heathen gods; this may easily have been his highly figurative way of describing the coming downfall of idolatry the world over. Similarly realistic terms are used in the denunciation of idols by writers who certainly looked upon them as mere nonentities, *e. g.* Is. 19^1 $46^{1.\ 2}$ Ps. 135^5; *cf.* Ez. 30^{13}. The verb used is in itself unambiguous (*cf.* Is. 10^{16} 17^{4} Mi. 6^{10} Ez. 24^{20}); but its appropriateness as applied to gods is doubtful. If the text is correct, the point of the figure lies either in the thought that by destroying the nations Yahweh will enfeeble their gods, whose existence is bound up with that of the nations worshipping them;* or in the fact that in earlier times, sacrificial offerings were looked upon as the "food of the gods" (*cf.* Ez. 44^{7}); hence, by causing the offerings to cease, Yahweh will deprive the gods of their means of support.—*And there shall bow down to him, each from his place, all the shores of the nations*] This vision of the world-wide acceptance of Yahweh as God of the nations far transcends the reach of faith in Zephaniah's time and indelibly stamps the verse as later; *cf.* Mi. 4^{1-4} Mal. 1^{11} Zc. 14^{6}. This representation of the heathen as worshipping Yahweh is in sharp contrast to the announcement of their destruction which follows immediately in vv. $^{12\,\text{ff.}}$. It is unnecessary to suppose that the writer conceives of the various peoples as undertaking pilgrimages to Jerusalem;† the preposition 'from' means only 'from the stand-point of,' *i. e.* in or at his own place; *cf.* Ps. 68^{29}.‡ 'Each' applies not to individuals,§ but to the various nations or lands constituting the inhabited world. For the idea of the lands as worshipping Yahweh, *cf.* Ps. 66^{4}. 'Place' in itself might mean 'sanctuary' like the Ar. *maqâm;*** but, the reference being to each nation, it is hardly likely that the writer would think of them all as having concentrated their worship at one sanctuary in each land, like the Jews.

---

* So Hi., Marti, Dr..

† *E. g.* Dav., van H..

‡ Its late origin is defended by all those cited as assigning vv. $^{8.\ 9}$ to a late date. But in favour of the separation of this as a gloss upon the foregoing oracle may be cited: Marti, Siev., van H., Fag., Stk..

§ So Hal. who places it after 2^{15}, while Buhl (*ZAW.* V, 182) places it with 3^9.

** So Sta.$^{\text{GVI.}}$, 644, Now., GASm., Marti, Dr., Siev., van H.; others treat vv. $^{8\text{-}11}$ as a unit all of which is equally late, so *e. g.* Oort (*Godgel. Bijd.* 186), Schw., We., Bu. (*SK.* 1893, pp. 394 *ff.*), Fag., Stk., Du., Kent.

This oracle offers a distinct change in the metre from the *qina* of the previous section. The movement is clearly hexameter and is fairly smooth and regular. It is adhered to even in some material (v. ^{11}) later subjoined to the original poem.

That vv. $^{10.\,11}$ form no part of the original oracle is shown as regards v. ^{10} by the fact that it merely repeats what has already been better said in v. ^{8} and that it descends to plain prose. V. ^{11} reveals its alien origin in the character of its contents and in the fact that it breaks away from the consideration of Moab and Ammon into a prediction of universal dominion.

---

* So *e. g.* Hi., Ke., Now..

† *Contra* Rosenm., de W., Ke., Kl., We..

‡ So Hi., Mau., Hd., Schw., Or., Dav., Dr..

§ *Contra* Ew., Hi., Dav., van H..

** So GASm..

The oracle against Moab and Ammon even cannot be assigned to Zephaniah, but must be held to have come from a later day; so Oort, *Godgeleerde Bijdragen*, 1865, pp. 812 *ff*.; Schw.; We.; Bu. *SK*. LXVI, 393 *ff*.; Cor.; Sm., 244; Now.; GASm.; Baud., *Einl*.; Marti; *CB*.; Siev.; Beer; Fag.; Stk.; Du.; Kent. The considerations which have brought so many interpreters to this view may be summarised. (1) The marked difference in rhythm from the context on both sides indicates diversity of authorship. (2) The oracle against Philistia in vv. $^{4-7}$ is more naturally followed by one against Egypt (v. ^{12}), the immediate neighbour of Philistia, than by one against Moab and Ammon on the eastern border of Judah. Moreover, if Zephaniah had in mind a devastation to be wrought by the Scythians, as seems probable, it is hardly likely that he would switch the line of march of their invading host suddenly away from the sea-coast to the opposite side of the Jordan. As a matter of fact, the Scythians seem to have confined their operations in Palestine to the coast. (3) The conduct of Moab and Ammon here denounced was that in which they indulged when emboldened by the disasters that befell Judah at the time of the Babylonian captivity; *cf*. Ob. vv. $^{10-14}$. No such feeling as this is manifested by the prophets against Moab and Ammon in any earlier period. (4) The expressions, 'remnant of my people' and 'remainder of my nation' are used in such a way as to presuppose the exile as an existing fact at the time when this oracle was written.

8. חרפת] 𝔊 pl.; so Schw.; but 𝔐 is preferable even though the coordinate noun here is pl.; for out of a total of more than seventy occurrences of ח׳, the pl. is used only three times in all, twice in the abs. and once in cstr.. For other cases of sg. and pl. conjoined, *v*. Is. 51^7 Je. 2^{19} Pr. 26^{23}.—בני עמון] So always; never simply ע׳; while it is always מואב, never בני מ׳ (so also ארם). On the other hand, either ישראל or בני י׳, אדום or בני א׳. Similar peculiarities appear in Ar. (We.).—יגדילו] *CB*. ילעיגו.—גבולם] 𝔊 𝔖^{H} = גבולִי; so Schw., Now., Marti (?), Hal., Fag.. But the change is unnecessary since the collective antecedent עמי furnishes sufficient basis for a pl. sf..—**9.** ממשק] 𝔊 *καὶ Λάμασκος*, wholly uncalled for in this context. 𝔙 *siccitas*, which affords no light. 𝔖 *and was destroyed*, perhaps conjectured from the context. Gr. קִמּוֹשׁ or קִמְּשֹׁנִים; so Now.. Marti מֹרֶשׁ (Is. 14^{23}); so Roth.. Van H. מִקְמַשׁ, 'place of weeds,' a denominative from קמוש. מ׳, a ἁπ., is usually rendered 'possession,' 'place of possession,' which is traced to משק (Gn. 15^2); but the latter word is as doubtful as this (*cf*. 𝔊 Μασεκ). Reliable witness to the meaning of מ is entirely lacking; we can but conjecture.—חרול] 𝔊 ἐκλελιμμένη = חרלה (Schw.). 𝔙 *spinarum*. 𝔗 מַלּוּחִין. ה׳ was probably some rank kind of weed, growing profusely on wild and neglected ground. The Syr. equivalent (*ḥurla*) means a kind of horse-fodder, some species of vetches.—ומכרה] 𝔊 *ὡς θιμωνιά*; clearly a guess;

cf. 𝔙 *et acervi.* Ehr. וּמִזְרֶה; so Fag.. Another *ἅπ.*, but evidently from √ כרה, 'dig'; whether it denotes natural or artificial caves and pits, or may be used of both kinds is uncertain.—מלח] 𝔊 *ἅλωνος*, probably an inner-Greek error for *ἁλός* (so Aq. Σ Θ) under the influence of *θιμωνιά*. Now. מַלּוּחַ, 'salt-wort' or 'mallow' (Jb. 30^4); so Marti, Roth. (?); this goes well as a parallel to 'weeds' or 'vetches,' but is wholly out of place with מכרה, if 'pit' or 'cave' be the true sense of the latter. On basis of 𝔊, Hal. reads the whole phrase, "Damascus shall be a ממשק of thorns and Edom a pit of salt, etc.." Schw. questions חרול ומ׳ מ׳ as a possible corruption of חֲרֵדָה וּמְלֵחָה; *cf.* Je. 17^6.—יבזום] Gr. יְבָנּוּם (?).—גוי] Rd. גּוֹיִי, with all the Vrss., 25 mss. of Kenn. and de R., and practically all interpreters.—**10**. To om. ויגדילו] and צבאות] solely mtr. cs. (so Now.^{K}; *cf.* Siev.), when there is no evidence that this verse was ever in metrical form is an arbitrary method of procedure. It is noteworthy that צ׳ occurs in Zephaniah only here and in v. ^{9}.—עַם] 𝔊$^{B.ℵ.A.Q}$ 𝔄 𝔖^H and HP. 48, 153, 233 om..—צבאות] 𝔖 adds, 'against Israel,' an explanatory gloss. —**11**. נורא] 𝔊^B *ἐπιφανήσεται*; so 𝔖. 𝔊^{ℵ*} *ἐπιφανὴς ἔσται*. Hence Buhl (*ZAW*. V, 182), נִרְאָה. 𝔙 *horribilis* (similarly 𝔗).—כי רזה] Rd. כִּי יְרַזֶּה, with Schw. (or רִזָּה); so Dr., Roth. (?). 𝔊 *καὶ ἐξολεθρεύσει*; so 𝔖. 𝔏 *et disperdet*. 𝔙 *et attenuabit*. Gr. יְזָרֶה; so Fag.. *CB*. בָּזָה. Now. יַכְרִית (?). Marti, הֵסִיר or יָסִיר. An impf. is better than a prophetic pf. here; and the Piʿel is necessary since the Niph. and the Ar. equivalent seem to point to the Qal as an intransitive. We. says, "ר׳ is impossible and ירזה scarcely right." But all attempts to substitute another vb. thus far have involved too radical a departure from 𝔐. —אלהי] 𝔊 *τοὺς θεοὺς τῶν ἐθνῶν*; so 𝔖^H. Θ om. *τῶν ἐθ'*. 𝔖 = מלכי; so Gr..—מן] For the sense 'from the stand-point of, in, at,' *cf.* מִבַּיִת, מִמּוּל, מִיָּמִין, מִפְּנֵי, מִקֶּדֶם, etc..—איי] Originally 'coasts,' 'islands'; but later designating countries as a whole (*e. g.* Is. $41^{1.5}$), *pars pro toto*.—הגוים] 𝔖 = *the seas*, but probably an inner Syr. error of ܝܡܡܐ for ܥܡܡܐ.

§ 6. THE DOOM OF ETHIOPIA AND ASSYRIA (2^{12-15}).

In another single str. of six lines, Zephaniah marks the southern limit of the Scythian invasion; then, returning to the opposite extreme of the world-empire of his day, announces the downfall of Assyria and describes in detail the desolation of Nineveh.

YOU, too, O Ethiopians, are the slain of my sword.
And he will stretch out his hand against the north and destroy Assyria;
And will make Nineveh a desolation, a drought like the desert.
And herds will lie down in the midst of her, every beast of the field.
Both pelican and porcupine will lodge in her capitals.
The owl will hoot in the window, the raven on the threshold.

This str., now standing alone, perhaps once formed the close of the poem beginning in 2^7.—**12.** *You, too, O Ethiopians*] The Ethiopians, dwelling south of the first cataract of the Nile are threatened with punishment, in all probability because the fact that they had ruled Egypt from about 720 to 654 B.C. was still fresh in Zephaniah's mind. A native Egyptian dynasty had secured possession of the throne once more only about twenty-five years before the time of Zephaniah. As a distant and powerful people in the extreme south (3^{10} Is. 11^{11} $18^{1\ f.}$ Ez. 38^5), the Ethiopians are contrasted with the Assyrians in the far north. It may be, of course, that Zephaniah sarcastically addresses the Egyptians themselves by this name, because of their long subjection to Ethiopia.—*Are the slain of my sword*] *Cf.* Ju. 7^{20} Is. 27^1 34^5 66^{16} Je. 25^{33} Ez. $21^{9.\ 13\ ff.}$. Zephaniah probably thought of the Scythians as destined to bring destruction upon those southern peoples. The representation of the Scythians as the sword of Yahweh (*cf.* Is. 10^5) recalls the later designation of Attila the Hun as "the scourge of God." The prophet's expectation failed of fulfilment, for the Scythians were turned back at the border of Egypt. Egypt suffered no serious setback till Necho was defeated at Carchemish in 605 B.C. by Nebuchadrezzar. Her complete overthrow was not accomplished until the reign of Cambyses, the Persian, in 525 B.C., about a century after the time of Zephaniah. The prophet is almost certainly announcing a future calamity rather than recording Egypt's actual condition when he spoke, and his oracle is probably incomplete; *v. i.*.—**13.** *And he will stretch out his hand against the north and destroy Assyria*] *Cf.* Is. 5^{25} $9^{12.\ 17.\ 21}$ 10^4 $14^{26\ f.}$. As the greatest political power of the time, Assyria is fittingly reserved to the last, as a climax to the series of judgments. Her sins were too well known to Zephaniah's audience for them to need recapitulation here.—*And will make Nineveh a desolation, a drought like the desert*] From the days of Sennacherib on down to Zephaniah's time Nineveh had been the capital of the Assyrian empire and the queen city of the world. Her reputation was worldwide and grew with the passing years; *cf.* Jon. 1^2 $3^{2\ f.}$ 4^{11}. To predict her speedy downfall was an exercise of undaunted faith. The devastation with which Zephaniah threatened her was even more terrible than that announced as impending over the Philistine cities, for Nineveh was to be swallowed up wholly by the desert. Such a condition as is here described would involve the drying up of the Tigris, which ran along the south-west side of the city, and also of the Khusur which skirted the north-west side. An extensive system of canals conveyed a plentiful supply of water within the walls. Gardens and orchards accordingly flourished. But prophecy knew no limits to the power of Yahweh.

14. *And herds will lie down in the midst of her*] On the face of things, it seems a bit incongruous for herds to be feeding in a region 'dry as the desert'; but the foregoing figure pictured the complete destruction of the city, while this adds to that picture the detail of the place's total desertion by man (*cf.* 2^7).—*Every beast of the field*] *i. e.* every kind of animal. For the text, *v. i.*. 𝔐 literally says, "every beast of a nation." A common interpretation of this is as an abbreviated form of 'every beast of every kind';* but there is no clear case of such an abbreviation, nor is there any evidence that 'nation' may mean 'kind' or 'sort.' Others interpret it of beasts that form groups, *i. e.* gregarious animals;† still others, "all beasts in crowds";‡ and Davidson, "Nineveh shall be a common pasture for every tribe of people." But these all force the Hebrew beyond the straining-point. Hence, We. emends to "a motley medley of mixed people," which does not satisfy the context at all, while others would change to "every beast of the swamp,"§ forgetting apparently the violent conflict thus occasioned with the preceding statement regarding the drought of the region.—*Both pelican and porcupine will lodge in her capitals*] The carved heads of Nineveh's many columns will, for the most part, be lying broken upon the ground and defiled by being made to serve as perches and nests for unclean birds and vermin. The exact meaning of the two words rendered 'pelican' and 'porcupine' is in doubt. The first is rendered 'chameleon' by 𝔊 and 'cormorant' by 𝔙. In Lv. 11^{18} Dt. 14^{17}, it is classed among the unclean birds; in Ps. 102^6, it is parallel to 'owl' and is made an inhabitant of the wilderness; in Is. 34^{11}, it is included among birds and is represented as frequenting desolate regions. It is evidently, therefore, some kind of wild bird found in solitary wastes. The only objection to 'pelican' is that as a consumer of fish, it would scarcely be found in a region 'dry as the desert'; perhaps, poetic license is equal to this. The 'porcupine' is, in Is. 14^{23}, associated with marshy ground and, in 34^{11}, with desolate regions as here. We do not look for porcupines in marshes; nor are they addicted exclusively to desolate places; nor should we expect them to be associated with birds as in Is. 34^{11} and here. But, on the other hand, the meaning, 'porcupine' or 'hedgehog' is assured for this word in Syr., Ar. and Eth.. The alternative rendering 'bittern,' which finds many followers, has no support in the Vrss. nor in the cognate tongues.—*The owl will hoot in the window, the raven on the threshold*] Owls and ravens are fit occupants of desolation; *cf.* Is. 34^{11} Ps. 102^{6}. In the picture of the raven at the door, Zephaniah anticipated Poe's *Raven*. 𝔐 as usually rendered is, "their voice shall sing in the windows; desolation (or drought) shall be in the thresholds." But the second half of the sentence presents a strange collocation of circumstances; and the first half introduces a pronoun, necessary to the sense, which is not present in 𝔐. The translation here adopted has the support of 𝔊.—*For cedar-work has been laid bare*] This fragment, which has no relation to the immediate context, is probably either due to corrupt dittog. from the following line,* or is a misplaced gloss on 'famish' in 2^{11}.†—**15.** *This is the exultant city that dwelt in security*] In the regular elegiac rhythm, a stanza of triumph over Nineveh now fallen was here appended to the original oracle by some pious reader. The phraseology of this verse is of common occurrence; *v.* Is. 22^{2} 23^{7} 32^{13} $47^{8.\,10}$.—*Saying in her heart, "I am and there is none else."*] Nineveh had long dwelt supreme. Not till within the quarter-century preceding Zephaniah's appearance had Assyria received any serious check in her career of world-conquest. Judah itself had been vassal for a half-century. The book of Nahum reflects the relief and satisfaction of the Jews when the tyrant's fall became inevitable.—*How has she become a*

---

* So *e. g.* Hi..

† So *e. g.* Rosenm, de W..

‡ Mau., Ew., Ke., RVm..

§ Hal., van H., Dr. (?).

---

* So Buhl (*ZAW*. V, 182), Schw. (?), Now. (?), Siev., Fag., Roth., Du., Kent (?).
† So Marti.

ruin, a lair for the wild beast] *Cf.* Je. 50^{23} 51^{41}. Her destruction was complete. Xenophon, passing the site in B.C. 401, was able to learn only that a great city had once occupied the spot and had been destroyed because Zeus had deprived its inhabitants of their wits.*—*Every one who passes by her hisses and shakes his fist*] Indicative of openly expressed scorn and fearless rage. The gesture is not elsewhere mentioned; *cf.* 1 K. 9^{8} Je. 19^{8} 49^{17} 50^{13} Ez. 27^{36} Jb. 27^{23} La. 2^{15} Ps. 22^{7}.

The *qina*-rhythm is resumed in this str., and this fact lends force to the view that in reality this section is only a continuation of § 4, which is composed in the same measure. Moreover, the course of the Scythian invasion led through Philistia on to Egypt and the writer would naturally follow that course in his description of the destruction wrought by them. It is then, at least, not improbable that 2^{1-7} was once continued by $2^{12\,\mathrm{ff.}}$; so Now., Marti, Siev., Fag., Stk., Du., Kent.

The foregoing considerations also support the view that this section is from the hand of Zephaniah himself; so Schw., Now., GASm., Marti, Dr., Siev., Fag., Stk., Du., Kent. It evidently anticipates the destruction of Nineveh and was, consequently, written prior to that event. The historical situation thus indicated seems to accord with the opinion that Zephaniah wrote this section. The argument of Bu. (*SK.* 1893, pp. 394 *f.*; so also Theiner, and Eich., *Einl.*^{4}, IV, 417) for the later origin of this oracle is by no means conclusive. His first objection to the early date is that Assy. is here treated without any reference to her relation to Israel and thus the oracle lacks any inner connection with the situation and differs widely from Is. 10. But surely the prophets were not mere copyists or venders of second-hand goods. Nor was it essential that they should always furnish an invoice of the injuries inflicted upon Israel by a foe; *cf.* Am. 2^{1-3}. Knowledge of these on the part of the audience might sometimes be taken for granted. The second consideration, viz. that the phraseology is late, concerns chiefly v. ^{15}, the late origin of which must be granted; *v. i.*.

The fact that Nineveh still stands furnishes a *terminus ad quem* not only for this oracle, but also for the work of Zephaniah as a whole. The actual fall of Nineveh at the hands of the Medes occurred in 607–606 B.C.. At what particular stage of the long struggle that preceded her overthrow Zephaniah pronounced this sentence upon her, we cannot tell with certainty. But if, as seems probable, these verses constitute a part of the prophecy beginning in 2^{1}, we shall have to place it in connection with the movements of the Scythians, about 627–626 B.C..

---

* *Anabasis*, bk. III, ch. IV, 10–12.

The oracle as found in 𝔐 is apparently not in its original form. It is more than likely that v. ^{12} is only the beginning of what was once a more or less extended judgment upon Egypt; so Schw., Now., Marti, Siev., van H., Roth.. It is scarcely probable that Zephaniah would devote relatively so much more space to the Philistines than to the Egyptians, when the latter people were second only to the Assyrians in influence and power among the nations of western Asia. It may be that the course of the Scythians in accepting ransom and tribute and possibly repulse from Egypt and in returning from her border without doing her any serious injury ran so diametrically counter to the prophet's expectations that the remainder of the original prophecy was in glaring contradiction to the facts and was therefore dropped. In compensation for this loss, an editor has added v. ^{15}. Its later origin is revealed by its almost hackneyed phraseology and by the fact that it looks upon the destruction of Nineveh as a *fait accompli;* so Now., Marti, Siev., Beer, Fag., Roth., Du..

12. גם־אתם] Gr. joins with v. ^{11}.—כושים] Gr. כֻּכ׳. Siev. adds רִפְלוֹ.—חרבי] 𝔖 om. sf.; so 3 mss. of Kenn. and 2 of de R.. Schw. חֶרֶב י׳; so GASm., Du.. We. חַרְבּוֹ; so Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, Now., Roth., Kent.—המה] Om. with one ms. of Kenn.; so Marti, Now.^{K}, Siev., Fag., Stk.. The Vrss. do not definitely recognise its presence, though they all take the sentence as declarative rather than vocative. The usage as in 𝔐 is without close analogy in OT., since when the pronoun is used as here to strengthen a pronominal subj. it always follows that subj. immediately; *e. g.* 2 S. 7^{28} Is. 37^{16} Ps. 44^{5}. The same usage is common in Syr. (Nö. *Syr. Grammar*, §221) and in Bibl. Aramaic (Ezr. 5^{11}). The position given ה׳ here is that customary with nominal subjects; *e. g.* Gn. 34^{21} 42^{11} Mal. 1^{12}.—**13.** ויט ידו] Rd. וְיִטֶּה ידו; so We., van H.. 𝔊$^{\aleph c.b.A.Q.\Gamma.}$ 𝔄 and HP. 23, 26, 40, 42, 49, 62, 68, 86, 87, 91, 97, 106, 147, 153, 198, 228, 233, 310 = וְאַטֶּה יָדִי; so 𝔍, Marti, Siev., Fag., Stk.. The foregoing sources for the most part retain 1st pers. all through verse. Ew. וַיֵּט. 𝔐 calls for the rendering, "and may he stretch forth"; but this gives a difficult connection with v. ^{14}. As the text stands, we should expect the pf. with wāw consec. in v. ^{13} as in v. ^{14}, but the received text is hard to account for on the supposition that that was the original text. Another possibility would be to treat them as impf. with wāw consec. continuing a prophetic pf. in the portion of the text now missing (so Ew.); but that is rendered difficult by ורבצו in v. ^{14}. The simplest procedure is to point the forms as impf. with simple wāw; *cf.* Ges.$^{\S 109k}$. It is unnecessary to attempt to secure adherence to the same person throughout this oracle, for the probability of a hiatus after v. ^{12} allows room for the introduction of a natural change of person in the material now lost.—כמדבר] 𝔗 = כַּיַם׳.—**14.** עדרים] We. עֲרָבִים, 'Arabs.' Stk. om..—כל] 𝔊 𝔖 𝔙 = וְכָל.—גוי] Om. as corrupt dittog. of the foll. גם and insert שָׂדַי

with 𝔊 𝔗 and de R. 20; so Now.. Others prefer הָאָרֶץ to שׂדי; so Gr., Marti, Siev., Roth., Stk., Kent. 𝔊 om. ג׳ and adds *τῆς γῆς*; so 𝔗, with בָּרָא = 'field.' Oort$^{Em.}$ om. ג׳ and changes preceding word to abs. חיה. Bach. אֲגַם, 'swamp.' Hal. גַּיְא, 'valley'; so van H., but with the meaning 'swamp'; *cf.* Dr.. The use of ג׳ in 𝔐 is abnormal. The phrase כל אלוה כל גוי (2 Ch. 32^{15}; *cf.* Ez. 17^{23} 44^{30}) is no real analogy for the proposed correction כל ח׳ כל גוי, where ג׳ = 'sort' or 'kind'; for in 2 Ch. 32^{15} ג׳ retains its original sense, 'nation' or 'people' and though it is perfectly natural to speak of the 'gods of the nations,' it is not so apparent why the animals should be conceived of as classified along national lines. We.'s proposal to resolve the problem by giving חיה the sense of 'group' or 'family,' as perhaps in 2 S. $23^{11.\ 13}$ Ps. 68^{11} 74^{19} (*cf.* Ar. حىّ) is untenable, since the resulting sense does not accord with the preceding ורבצו ע׳; it also calls for ג׳ in the pl..—בכפתריה] 𝔖 *in its houses.* 𝔊 *ἐν τοῖς φατνώμασιν.*—קול ישורר בחלון] Rd. כוס י׳ ב׳; so We., Now., GASm., Marti, Dr., Siev., Fag., Roth., Du., Kent. 𝔊 *καὶ θηρία φωνήσει ἐν τοῖς διορύγμασιν αὐτῆς.* 𝔙 *vox cantantis in fenestra.* Kenn. 112 (?), 245, ישודר; 4, ישׂורר. Schw. suggests that ישורר represents the name of a bird, *e. g.* וָשֶׁר or יַנְשׁוּף; the latter is adopted by Now., Hal., Dr. (?), being joined to the preceding word by וְ. Bach. ק׳ שׁקֵר ב׳.—חרב בסף] Rd. עֹרֵב, with 𝔊 *κόρακες ἐν τοῖς πυλῶσιν αὐτῆς*; so Ew., Schw., Gr., We., Bach., GASm., Oort$^{Em.}$, Now., Marti, Hal., Dr., Siev., Fag., Roth., Du., Kent. 𝔊$^{\aleph *}$ HP. 228 om.. 𝔙 *corvus.* Aq. Σ 𝔖 = חֹרֶב.—כי ארזה ערה] 𝔊 *διότι κέδρος τὸ ἀνάστημα* (𝔊^{Q*}, *ἀντάλλαγμα*) *αὐτῆς.* 𝔙 *quoniam attenuabo robor ejus* (= עֻזָּהּ). 𝔖 *because its root is laid bare*, perhaps an inner Syr. error of ܟܡܘܪܗ for ܟܘܪܡܗ (Seb.). Bach. כִּי עֶרְוָה עֵרָה, 'for one has laid bare shame.' Oort$^{Em.}$ substitutes ואמרו for the whole clause. Ew. treats אֶרְזֶה as vb. in 3d pers. Hiph. √ רזה; so Hi., We. (?). The *ἅπ.* ארזה might be pointed אֲרָזָה. If 𝔐 is correct, ערה is best taken with indefinite subj. as equivalent to the passive.—15. 𝔊 connects this verse with ch. 3.—זאת] 𝔏 om.. Gr. הַזּאת; so Roth..—העליזה] 𝔖 *fortified;* similarly 𝔗.—אפסי] So Is. $47^{8.\ 10}$. Best treated as analogous to מִנִּי and זוּלָתִי (*cf.* Ges.$^{\S\ 90l\ \text{and}\ 152}$), with so-called paragogic י; for א׳ elsewhere takes no sf., nor does it have the meaning 'besides,' which the addition of the sf. requires.—מרבץ] 𝔊 *νομή.*—ישרק] 𝔖 and Kenn. 145 = יָשֹׁם ישרק. Bab. Cod. ישם originally, but corrected to ישרק; so de R. 1092.—ידו] 𝔊 = יָדָיו.—𝔖 adds at end of verse, וְאָמַר.

§ 7. THE SIN OF JERUSALEM AND THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF YAHWEH (3[1-7]).

An incomplete prophecy of which only two full strs. and part of a third remain. **Str. I** charges Jerusalem with disobedience and faithlessness to Yahweh (vv. [1. 2]). **Str. II** arraigns the officials responsible for the political, judicial and religious welfare of the city (vv. [3. 4]). **Str. III** sets in contrast with the foregoing the justice and faithfulness of Yahweh (v. [5]). To this fragment are loosely attached two other fragments (vv. [6. 7]), having no intimate connection with that which precedes them.

ALAS, O defiant and defiled one, the oppressing city!
She has listened to no voice, she has accepted no correction.
In Yahweh she has not trusted; to her God she has not drawn near.
HER princes within her are roaring lions.
Her judges are evening wolves; they have left nothing till the morning.
Her prophets are reckless, men of treachery.
Her priests have profaned the holy; they have done violence to instruction.
YAHWEH is righteous within her; he will not do wrong.
Morning by morning he establishes his justice; light fails not.

Str. I contains three lines addressed to Jerusalem and charging her with rebellion against Yahweh.—**1.** *Alas, O defiant and defiled one, the oppressing city!*] That Jerusalem is the one thus characterised is shown by v. [2]. The grounds for the charge are given in vv. [2-4]; *cf.* Is. 1[21]. The city's attitude toward Yahweh is here indicated, together with her standing in his sight and her attitude toward the weak.—**2.** *She has listened to no voice; she has accepted no correction*] This charge is repeated almost *verbatim* in Je. 7[28]. Jerusalem has turned a deaf ear to the voice of God as it has spoken through the prophets. This is a frequent accusation; *cf.* Je. 7[23 f.] 11[4. 7 f.] 22[21] Zc. 7[8-12]. The 'correction' referred to is the chastening afflictions sent upon the city of Yahweh, which failed to turn the stubborn and rebellious people from the errors of their ways. *Cf.* Am. 4[6-11].—*In Yahweh she has not trusted; to her God she has not drawn near*] The implication is that Jerusalem has had recourse to everything and everybody but Yahweh. Horses and chariots, foreign powers and foreign gods have been her reliance rather than Yahweh, who alone can help her. Unwavering faith in Yahweh was always demanded of Israel by the prophets; *cf.* 1 K. 18^{21} Is. 7^{9} Ho. 4^{12} 5^{7} Jos. 24^{15}. This lack of faith was the inevitable result of Jerusalem's refusal to hearken to the instruction of the prophets, her religious teachers.

Str. II characterises the four leading classes in Jerusalem's civic and religious life and furnishes specific illustrations of the general proposition laid down in **Str. I.**—**3.** *Her princes within her are roaring lions*] Those who should shepherd the people are themselves devouring them; *cf.* $1^{8\,\text{ff.}}$ Mi. 2^{2} Zc. $11^{4.\,5}$ Pr. 28^{15}.—*Her judges are evening wolves*] 𝔊 has 'wolves of Arabia'; others suggest, 'wolves of the Arabah' (*cf.* Je. 5^{26}); but 𝔐 is better, since 'evening' is brought into contrast with 'morning' of the following phrase; *cf.* Hb. 1^{8}. Wolves are in the habit of prowling by night in search of prey. Judges are set for the defence of the rights of the weak; but with wolfish greed, these seek their substance; *cf.* Mi. 3^{11} Is. 1^{23} Ez. 22^{27}.—*They have left nothing till the morning*] A characteristic of the rapacity of wolves which fittingly illustrates the temper of these dishonest officials. This translation is adopted from 𝔊 and 𝔙, but is without other support, save that it suits the context well. The meaning of the verb elsewhere is 'gnaw' or 'crunch bones'; but the negative here makes that meaning altogether inappropriate. The phrase may be descriptive of either the wolves or the judges; but in the present uncertainty as to its meaning, it is impossible to decide between them. The same uncertainty renders it unwise to omit the phrase as a gloss as some have done.*—**4.** *Her prophets are reckless, men of treachery*] This is the first and only accusation brought against the prophets by Zephaniah. The epithets used imply a wanton disregard of Yahweh and his moral requirements. The prophets of past generations inculcated faith and loyalty; these are faithless men; *cf.* Mi. 2^{11} $3^{5\,\text{ff.}\,11}$. The prophets of Israel's higher life always found themselves in conflict with another class of prophets whose vision was immeasurably inferior; *v.* note on Mi. 3^{5}.—*Her priests have profaned that which is holy*] One of the priestly functions, according to Lv. 10^{10}, was "to make a distinction between the holy and the common and between the unclean and the clean." There is no reason to suppose that this function was not one of the earliest assumed by or assigned to the priests. Zephaniah probably refers here to ritualistic irregularities which reflected a criminal carelessness of the requirements of Yahweh on the part of the priests. —*They have done violence to instruction*] An important priestly function was that of delivering the judgment of Yahweh in cases of doubt and dispute; *cf.* Dt. 17^{8-12} 21^{5}. This was called *tôrah, i. e.* 'teaching' or 'oracle,' and constituted a decision by the court of last resort. The priests evidently sold the decision to the highest bidder and so brought the priesthood of Yahweh into disgrace in the eyes of all right-minded men. They prostituted their highest and most sacred powers to the accomplishment of selfish and base ends. The sensuousness and materialism of the priesthood always constituted a most serious obstacle in the path of the true prophets; *cf.* Ho. 4^{6-9} 5^{1} 6^{9} Am. $7^{10\,\text{ff.}}$ Mi. 3^{11} Is. 28^{7}. Jeremiah's estimate of the priesthood accords with that of Zephaniah; *cf.* Je. 2^{8} 5^{31} 6^{13} 14^{18}.

---

* So *e. g.* We., Marti, Fag..

Str. III passes over to a consideration of the character of Yahweh as it is manifested not only in his dealings with his people, but even in the regularity of the course of nature.—**5.** *Yahweh is righteous within her*] The content of the term 'righteous' here is at least partly indicated in the immediately following sentences. He is upright and reliable; there is no swerving in his course of action. The use of this word as applied to Yahweh is not necessarily an evidence of the late origin of this passage. It is true that the thought of Yahweh as righteous comes into prominence first in Is. 40 *ff.* (*e. g.* 41^{10} 42^{21} $45^{19.\,21}$). But it is quite improbable that the idea burst forth suddenly into full bloom; there naturally would be preliminary stages of development. Yahweh's demand for righteousness on the part of his people, which is so strongly insisted upon by Amos, presupposes righteousness in Yahweh himself. He is indeed described as 'righteous' already in a J passage, viz. Ex. 9^{27}, and the same epithet is employed with reference to him in Dt. 32^{4} Je. 12^{1}, the first of which passages is probably from about the same time as Zephaniah.—*He will not do wrong*] This is the negative side of the preceding positive affirmation. Unrighteousness or injustice on Yahweh's part is unthinkable.—*Morning by morning he establishes his justice; light fails not*] This is a concrete illustration taken from the invariable order of nature, which was recognised by the prophets as the order of God, of the absolute and unwavering righteousness of Yahweh. Just as he acts with unfailing regularity in the order of the physical universe so likewise does he in the moral order; *cf.* Ho. 6^5. For morning as the time of dispensing justice, *cf.* Je. 21^{12}. 𝔐, as rendered in RV., reads, "every morning (or, morning by morning) doth he bring his justice to light; he faileth not." This has been variously interpreted, *e. g.* Yahweh daily manifests his justice (1) through the protection he affords the prophet,* or (2) through the revelation of the rectitude of his character effected by the temple-ritual and the teachings of the prophets,† or (3) by the fact that he rewards virtue and punishes vice.‡ But the Hebrew of 𝔐 cannot be rendered 'bring to light,' which is un-Hebraic; it can only be translated, 'he establishes his justice as light.' Yet the idiom 'establish justice as light,' lit. 'give his justice for light,' is obscure in meaning. Moreover, the division of the line as required by 𝔐 brings the cæsura into the wrong place. Hence the slight change of text here adopted.—*But the unjust knows not shame*] This is a gloss § as is shown by its superfluity in the parallelism and by the fact that the context is not contrasting Yahweh with the 'unjust' as a class, but with the officials in particular and the people as a whole. Marti's attempt to save the line by an emendation, reading 'error is unknown,' does not aid the parallelism and involves the elision of 'shame' as a gloss.

Vv. $^{6.\,7}$ have no relation either with the preceding or following context, or with one another. They are isolated fragments; *v. i.*.—**6.** *I have cut off nations; their battlements are destroyed*] The perfect tense here may have been used in a prophetic sense, "I will cut off," etc.. The context affords no aid in the resolution of that doubt. There were many occasions in Israel's history when such a statement might have been made as historical fact; *e. g.* after the Scythian invasion, or after the victorious career of Cyrus. There were even more occasions when prophets longed for and predicted such victories on Yahweh's part, *e. g.* Je. $28^{3.\,4.\,10.\,11}$. Statements concerning the nations are wholly alien to this context, which is concerned solely with the relations between Yahweh and Judah. The nexus usually made is that just as Yahweh's activities in the course of nature have failed to influence his people, so likewise his chastisements of foreign nations for their sins have produced no effect upon Israel. But even if this were possible without an explicit statement to that effect in the text, yet the difficulty of the sudden change to the first person and the drop to the tetrameter line would remain.—*I have made their streets desolate with no passer-by*] Schw.'s proposal to render 'open country' (as in Jb. 5^{10} 18^{7} Pr. 8^{26} Ps. 144^{13}) instead of 'streets,' because streets would hardly be mentioned before the towns themselves, is unreasonable. The prophets were not fettered by logical strait-jackets.—*Their cities have been laid waste, so that there is no man, no inhabitant*] For similar pictures, *cf.* 2^{5} Is. 5^{9} 6^{11} Je. $9^{10.\,12}$ 32^{43} $33^{10.\,12}$ Ez. 14^{13}. The phrase "no man" is probably a variant of "no inhabitant," since the one renders the other unnecessary and the metre becomes regular when one is omitted.*—**7.** *I thought, "Surely, she will fear me, she will accept correction"*] Yahweh is evidently recalling his former thoughts regarding Jerusalem. His expectations for her had met with disappointment; *cf.* 3^{2}. 𝔐 and the Vrss. have, "thou wilt fear, etc."; but in view of the immediately following use of the third person in the same sentence, the slight change necessary to produce the third person here should probably be made.—"*And there will not be cut off from her sight anything that I have laid upon her*"] *i. e.* Yahweh had hoped that his injunctions had been so deeply engraved upon Jerusalem's mind and heart that the memory of them would never fade away. For this sense for פקד על, *cf.* Jb. 36^{23} 2 Ch. 36^{23} = Ezr. 1^{2}. For text, *v. i.*. 𝔐 reads "her dwelling" in place of "her eyes"; but this yields a wellnigh impossible sense. The usual rendering, as in RV., "so her dwelling should not be cut off, *according to* all that I have appointed concerning her," really requires a change of text, since it involves too great an ellipsis; for the italicised words are not present in 𝔐. Schw. would cut the Gordian knot by dropping "all that I have appointed concerning her" as a gloss.* —*But they zealously made all their doings corrupt*] They deliberately, and apparently with enthusiasm, set about doing the exact opposite of that which Yahweh required. The literal rendering is "they rose up early and corrupted all their doings"; this figure is found elsewhere only in Jeremiah (eleven times, viz. $7^{13.\ 25}$ 11^{7} 24^{4} $25^{3.\ 4}$ 26^{5} 29^{19} 32^{33} 35^{14} 44^{4}) and in 2 Ch. 36^{15}.

---

* Hal.. † Ke., Hd.. ‡ Hi., Mau., Dr., *et al.*. § So Schw., Du., *et al.*.

---

* So Schw., Bach., Marti., Hal., Now.^{K}, Siev., Fag., Roth., Stk..

The measure of this poem is irregular, conforming to no single standard. The parallelism, however, is very regular; hence the length of the lines is in each case clearly indicated. The *qina*-rhythm is found in vv. $^{1.\ 3b.\ 4b.\ 5}$; while vv. $^{2.\ 3a.\ 4a}$ have lines of four beats each. Str. II is brought into conformity with Str. I by Marti through the elision of לא גרמו לבקר (v. ^{3}) and אנשי בגדות (v. ^{4}); so also Fag. (*cf.* Siev.). But this is unnecessary from any other point of view than that of poetic form, and it likewise involves placing two classes of offenders in one line, while a full line is devoted to each of the other classes. Furthermore, vv. $^{3b.\ 4a}$, as they stand in 𝔐, have the same general form as ^{4b}.

That the oracle, as it is in 𝔐, is only a torso is practically certain. It is shown not only by the incomplete character of Str. III, but also by its failure to round out the thought. Strs. I and II denounce Jerusalem and its leaders for sin and Str. III depicts the character of the righteous God in contrast to his wicked city; but the indispensable conclusion, viz. a threat of punishment upon the city, is wholly lacking. In its place, v. ^{6} opens up a new theme, the destruction of the heathen nations. For this reason, Bu. (*SK.* 1893) would place v. ^{6} after v. ^{8}. This, however, is not satisfactory, for it forces an unwelcome intruder between vv. ^{8} and ^{9}, which are intimately interrelated, and the resulting connection between vv. ^{5} and ^{7} is little better than that between vv. ^{5} and ^{6}. For in v ^{5}, the prophet speaks of Yahweh's righteousness and uses the third person, while in v. ^{7} Yahweh himself speaks and the subject is the city's wickedness which was under discussion in v. ^{1}. Vv. $^{6.\ 7}$ are not only out of place where they are located in 𝔐, but they also lack any mutual connection of their own. They can only be treated as two separate fragments, explicable either as glosses, or as torn out of other contexts wherein they originally stood, or as remnants of oracles now lost to us; *cf.* GASm. on v. ^{6}.

Some interpreters deny 3^{1-5} to Zephaniah and place it somewhere in the exilic or postexilic age; so Sta.^{GVI}, 644; Schw.; We.; Marti; Siev.; Beer (?); Fag.; Du.. But the evidence cited in behalf of this view is hardly convincing. It is of three kinds, (1) linguistic, (2) late parallels, (3) a different conception of Israel's sin from that presented in $1^{2\ \text{ff.}}$. The linguistic argument is based upon נצרו , ואל , ינה , חוצות , צריק and פקד על. But with our present sources of information regarding the history of Heb. words as meagre as they are, no confidence can be placed in conclusions based upon the number of occurrences or the character of the usage of such words as these. The argument from parallel passages is to the effect that this oracle reflects the same social and religious background as Mi. 7^{1-6} Is. $56^{9\,ff.}$ Ez. 22. The date of Mi. 7^{1-6}, however, is by no means certain (*v. ad loc.*), and the lapse of time between Zephaniah on the one hand and Ezekiel and Is. 56 on the other is too slight to warrant the conclusion that Zephaniah could not have held such sentiments as are here expressed, even though Ezekiel and the author of Is. 56 *ff.* shared them at a later period. Nor were the religious and social conditions so radically different in Zephaniah's time as necessarily to render his utterances widely different in character from those of his immediate successors. The third argument, that the charges against Jerusalem are different here from those in ch. 1, is certainly true. But surely no prophet is to be restricted to the constant reiteration of what he has once said. The charges are exactly such as might be expected of Zephaniah, and indeed they do breathe forth the same moral indignation as that which characterises ch. 1. Hence, it seems the part of caution to continue to attribute this oracle to Zephaniah until more convincing testimony to the contrary is forthcoming; so *e. g.* Dav., Now., GASm., Bu., Dr., van H., Roth., Stk., Kent.

---

* Similarly Siev..

1. מֹוראה] A ל״ה root treated as a ל״א; Ges.$^{\S\,75rr}$. 𝔊 *ἡ ἐπιφανής*; *cf.* 𝔖, *the well-known.* Θ *ἡ ἀθετοῦσα*; *cf.* 𝔙 *provocatrix.* 𝔗 דְמִיתְיָא, 'hasty.' Bab. Cod. without ו; so many mss. of Kenn. and de R.. Fag. מָרָה. Bach. יוֹם הַמְּרָא.—ונגאלה] = ונגעלה, as in Is. 59^{3} and often. This is perhaps the oldest known occurrence of this weaker form of the √; *cf.* Mal. 1^{7}. The anarthrous form of this and the preceding prtc. is not sufficient reason for making them predicates (Schw.), rather than vocatives; *cf.* Ges.$^{\S\,126t}$. It may indicate that they were regarded almost as appellative proper names (*cf.* Marti). 𝔊 *καὶ ἀπολελυτρωμένη.* Schw. מְעָלָה. Bach. וְהַגּוֹלָה.—העיר] Gr. *del.* ה. 𝔖 treats 'ע as vocative, placing it at beginning of the verse and repeating it at the close as in 𝔐.—היונה] 𝔊 *ἡ περιστερά.* Σ *ἡ ἀνόητος* 𝔖 *of Jonah.*—**3.** אריות] 𝔊 *ὡς λ'*; so 𝔙 𝔖 𝔗.—ערב] 𝔊 *τῆς 'Αραβίας.* 𝔙 *vespere;* so 𝔖 𝔗. Σ *ἑσπερινοί.* Bach. מֵרֶף, as in Hb. 1^{8}.—לא גרמו] The use of the pf. does not justify the treatment of this clause as a gloss (*contra* We., Marti); all the vbs. of the context are in the pf.. The pf. here is used as a gnomic aorist; *cf.* Ges.$^{\S\,106k}$. In Nu. 24^{8}, 'ג is clearly a denominative from גֶּרֶם, meaning 'gnaw' or 'crunch'; in Ez. 23^{34} a similar sense fits poorly and the text is uncertain. In both Ar. and Syr. the √ = 'cut off' and the meaning 'leave over' found in the Vrss. is not far removed from that. 𝔙 *non relinquebant.* 𝔊 *οὐχ ὑπελίποντο.* 𝔗 לא מורנין. Schw. and

Du. om. לא. Bach. לא הָֽמְּו לַבֹּקֶר. Hal. לא גָֽרְמוּ. Roth. לא יֶֽרְמוּ. Several interpreters abandon ג׳ as hopeless; so Now., GASm., Marti, Fag., Stk..—**4.** נביאיה] Gr. נשיאיה.—פחזים] This √ in its various forms always denotes a human characteristic, viz. Ju. 9^4 Gn. 49^4 and in Je. 23^{32} where it is applied to the prophets as here. 𝔊 *πνευματοφόροι.* Aq. *θαμβευταί.* 𝔙 *vesani.*—אנשי בגדות] We should expect either אנשים בגדים or אנשי בגדות. The ending ות apparently has an abstract force here = to ות; *cf.* אבות and Assy. *abûtu.* Marti and Fag. om. phrase as gloss. Siev. om. אנשי and reads בגדו with כ׳ as subj., all the remainder of v. ^{4} being dropped.—חמסו] Gr. מָאֲסוּ.—**5.** לא] 𝔊 = ולא.—בבקר ב׳] For the same idiom, with distributive force, *v.* Is. 50^4 Ex. 16^{21} 2 S. 13^{14}; *cf.* Ges $^{\S\,123c}$. 𝔊 *πρωὶ πρωί.* 𝔙 *mane mane.* 𝔖 = בב׳ ובב׳. Roth. om. one בב׳.—לאור] Schw. makes ל distributive as in Am. 4^4 (*q. v.*); but אור is never used as a synonym of יום. Rd. אור, with ל om. as dittog. from foll. לא; so Marti, Siev., Fag., Du., Kent. 𝔊 *εἰς φῶς.* 𝔙 *in lucem.* $𝔖^H$ om., but puts it in marg.. Some om. as dittog. or gloss; *e. g.* We., Roth., Stk.. Bach. לָאֳוֶן. Van H. לָאִיר.—לא נעדר] 𝔊 *καὶ οὐκ ἀπεκρύβη.* 𝔙 *et non abscondetur.* 𝔖 *and will not delay.* $𝔖^H$ om., but puts it in marg.. Bach. לא יעמר. Roth. ולא נ׳. Van H. adds לנצח.—לא יורע עול ב׳] $𝔊^B$ has a double rendering, viz. *οὐκ ἔγνω ἀδικίαν ἐν ἀπαιτήσει* (=בְּשֹׁאת) *καὶ οὐκ εἰς νῖκος ἀδικίαν ἐν διαφθορᾷ* (= בְּשַׁחַת). $𝔊^A$ HP. 23 om. *καὶ οὐκ ἀπεκρύβη . . . ἀπαιτήσει.* $𝔊^Q$ HP. 26, 49, 106, 130, 153, 233, 311 om. *εἰς φῶς . . . ἀπαιτήσει.* HP. 95, 185 om. *καὶ οὐκ ἀπεκρύβη . . . ἀδικίαν.* HP. 198 om. *εἰς φῶς καὶ οὐκ ἀπεκρύβη.* HP. 239 and Comp. om. *ἐν ἀπαιτήσει* to end of verse. HP. 238 has *εἰς φῶς* to end of verse under asterisk. But these variants are of no critical value, being due largely to copyists' errors. 𝔙 *nesciit autem iniquus confusionem.* $𝔖^H$ ܘܠܐ ܒܗܬܬܐ ܥܘܠܐ; but it foll. 𝔐 in marg.. Marti, ולא נודַע עָוֶל; so Siev., Fag., Kent. Roth. ולא יֵדַע עָוֶל. Van H. ולא יורע עָוֶל.—בשת] Om. as a gloss by Marti, Siev., Fag., van H., Roth., and Kent. Marti, however, suggests the possibility of its being a remnant of an original בְּשׁוּבוֹ אֶת שְׁבוּתָם.

6. גוים] 𝔊 *ὑπερηφάνους* = גֵּאִים (Schw.); so van H..—פנותם] 𝔊 *γωνίαι αὐτῶν.* 𝔖 ܕܘ̈ܝܐ, 'miseries,' probably an inner-Syr. error for ܙܘ̈ܝܐ as in 1^{16} (Seb.).—נצדו] *ἅπ.*, but common in Aram.. It occurs also in Assy., viz. *uṣaddi* = "I destroyed" (III R. 9, No. 1, 8), if the reading be correct; *cf.* Dl.^{HWB}, 563b; Muss-Arnolt, *Assy. Dict.* 870a; also in *ṣu-di-e annûti tu-ṣa-ad-di-šu-nu-ti* (IV R. 55, 30b, where the context is too fragmentary to render exact assignment and interpretation of the vb. possible); *v.* Meissner, *Supplement zu den Assy. Wörterbüchern*, 80b. In view of these Assy. possibilities, the common statement that נ׳ must be of Aram. origin and therefore a sign of late age is somewhat hazardous. The fact that there was an Aram. speaking colony of Jews in Elephantine in Egypt at least as early as shortly after 600 B.C. also makes arguments from the use of Aramaicisms of uncertain value. Gr. reads נֻצּוּ; so Bach..—7. אמרתי] = 'I thought,' as often, *e. g.* Gn. 20^{11} 26^{9}.—אך] 𝔊 *πλήν*.—תקחי . . . תיראי] Rd. in 3d pers. תִּירָא and תִּקַּח; so We., GASm., Or., Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, Now., Marti, Siev., Fag., Roth., Du..—יכרת] 𝔊$^{\text{B}}$ *ἐξολοθρευθῆτε*. 𝔊$^{\aleph *}$ *ἐξολεθρευθηται*. 𝔊$^{\text{AQΓ}}$ *ἐξολεθρευθῆτε*. 𝔊$^{\aleph\text{ c.b.}}$ HP. 68, 87, 91, 97, 228, 310 *ἐξολοθρευθῇ*. Gr. יִסָּתֵר (?). Siev. תִּכָּרֵת.—מעונה] Rd. מֵעֵינֶיהָ, with 𝔊 𝔖; so Gr., We., GASm., Or., Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, Now., BDB., Marti, Dr., van H., Fag., Roth., Du., Kent. Bach. מְעֻנָּה.—כל־אשר] Hal. ככל א׳.—אכן השכימו] 𝔊 *ἑτοιμάζου ὄρθρισον*; so 𝔖.—השחיתו] 𝔊 *ἔφθαρται*. 𝔖 *and destroy*. 𝔐 has two vbs. in asyndeton, the first of which is logically subordinate to the second; Ges.$^{\S\,120\text{g}}$.—עלילותם] 𝔊 *ἐπιφυλλὶς αὐτῶν*. 𝔙 *cogitationes suas*.

§ 8. JERUSALEM DELIVERED (3^{8-13}).

In three strs. of four lines each, Jerusalem is assured that the nations will perish, while she herself after her purification will be restored to the favour of Yahweh. **Str. I** bids Jerusalem look forward to the day when Yahweh's judgment will overtake the nations of the earth (v. ^{8}). **Str. II** informs her that a work of cleansing and elimination must take place among her own people (vv. $^{11.\ 12}$). **Str. III** states the characteristics of the purified remnant and predicts for it a happy and peaceful life.

THEREFORE, wait for me, it is the oracle of Yahweh, for the day when I arise as a witness.
For it is my decision to gather nations, to assemble kingdoms,
That I may pour out upon them my wrath, all the heat of mine anger.
For in the fire of my zeal all the earth will be consumed.
IN that day thou wilt not be shamed by any of thy deeds wherein thou hast rebelled against me.
For then I shall remove from the midst of thee thy proudly exulting ones;
And thou wilt no more be haughty in my holy mountain.
But I shall leave in the midst of thee a people humble and poor.
AND the remnant of Israel will seek refuge in the name of Yahweh.
They will do no wickedness nor will they speak lies;
Nor will there be found in their mouth a deceitful tongue.
For they will feed and lie down with none to disturb them.

Str. I adjures Israel to live in hope of seeing Yahweh's vengeance upon the nations in general.—**8.** *Therefore, wait for me, it is the oracle of Yahweh*] If 'therefore' is based upon the immediately preceding context, its only meaning can be something like 'in view of these facts.' The word 'wait' usually implies hope and confidence (*e. g.* Is. 8^{17} Hb. 2^{3} Ps. 33^{20}), but not always so (*e. g.* 2 K. 7^{9} 9^{3} Jb. 32^{4}). Its significance here, therefore, must be determined from the context. To whom is the exhortation addressed? Evidently not to the nations, for they are at once spoken of in the third person. Consequently, some interpreters say that the prophet addresses the people of Judah as a whole, ironically bidding them await the day of universal judgment, when they themselves will share with the nations in the destruction decreed by Yahweh.* Others, with better right, look upon the community of the pious in Judah as the party addressed, and find here a word of comfort for them,† viz. "wait confidently for the coming day of judgment, when you will be vindicated and all the wicked destroyed"; *cf.* v. ^{11}.—*For the day when I shall arise as a witness*] This defines more explicitly the "for me" of the previous clause. 𝔐 reads "rise up to the prey"; 𝔊 𝔖 read "rise up as a witness." After the verb, 'rise up,' something expressive of aggressive action is expected, but 'to the prey' hardly satisfies the expectation. Ew. attempts to meet it by rendering "to the attack"; but this is wholly unsupported by the usage of the Hebrew word. Most of the recent interpreters follow 𝔊. For the thought of Yahweh appearing as a witness, *cf.* Mi. 1^{2} Mal. 3^{5} Je. 29^{23}. Yahweh's testimony will be given not against Jerusalem,‡ but against the nations or against the wicked wherever they may be, whether inside or outside of Israel.—*For it is my decision to gather nations, to assemble kingdoms*] There is not a word here about gathering them to or against Jerusalem§ (*cf.* Zc. $14^{1\,\text{ff.}}$ Jo. 3^{11-16} Ez. 38, 39); nor is it necessary to suppose that such a thought was in the writer's mind. "The 'gathering' merely expresses the idea that they shall be universally and simultaneously judged";** *cf.* Je. 25^{31-33} Is. 66^{16}. The 'decision' or 'decree' is the purpose formed in Yahweh's own mind.—*That I may pour out upon them my wrath, all the heat of mine anger*] This is a very common figure; *cf.* Ho. 5^{1} Je. 10^{25} Is. 42^{25} Ps. 69^{25} 79^{6} and fifteen times in Ezekiel. The only natural reference of the pronoun 'them' is to the aforesaid nations and kingdoms.—*For in the fire of my zeal all the earth will be consumed*] *Cf.* 1[18]. The judgment is to be world-wide and all-embracing. In this fiery furnace all the dross will be consumed; nothing but pure metal will survive the ordeal. This sentence is evidently original here; it forms the necessary climax to the description of punishment.*

---

* So Hi., Mau., Now., GASm..

† So Hd., Or., Dr., Marti.

‡ *Contra* Now..

§ *Contra* Schw., Marti.

** Dav..

At this point, an editor, actuated by more kindly and generous feelings toward the nations than are reflected by the foregoing threats, has inserted a section expressing his own sentiments; *v. i.*.—**9.** *For then I shall turn unto the peoples a purified speech*] An elliptical expression meaning that Yahweh will turn the speech of the nations that is now impure into a speech that will be pure; *cf.* Is. 6[5]. The impurity, of course, consisted in the fact that they prayed to and swore by other gods than Yahweh. The purification will consist in their being brought to abandon the worship of any and every god save Yahweh; *cf.* Ho. 2[12] Ps. 16[4]. Contact with other gods was, from the point of view of Yahweh-worship, fraught with uncleanness and impurity of the most pronounced type.—*So that all of them may call upon the name of Yahweh and serve him with one consent*] The result of the purification is here specifically stated. Yahweh alone will be the object of the world's worship. The same expectation of the conversion of the nations as a whole to the worship of Yahweh is found in Mi. 4[2] Zc. 14[16 ff.] Is. 11[9] 19[23 ff.]. The idiom 'call upon the name of Yahweh' probably had its origin in the cultus and dates from the time when the mere utterance of the divine name *per se* was believed to exercise a kind of coercion upon the deity himself. To possess the name of the deity was to hold a certain power over him and thus, within certain clearly defined limits, to make him subservient to the worshipper's will.† Such primitive conceptions were far from the thought of the writer of this passage; but this idiom is a survival. "With one consent," lit. "with one shoulder"; 𝔊 "with one yoke," rightly interpreting the figure which does not occur elsewhere in Hebrew, though familiar in Syriac. It probably rests upon the fact that oxen were joined together by one yoke in their labour. The idea of unanimity is pictured in 1 K. 22^{13} by the phrase "with one mouth." The essential thought finds utterance in plain prose in Je. 32^{39} Ez. $11^{19.\,20}$, though there predicated of Israel in the Messianic age, rather than of the nations as here. There is no necessity to change 'Yahweh' and 'him' to the first personal pronoun; in speeches placed upon Yahweh's lips the prophetic writers frequently lapse into the third person.—**10.** *Beyond the rivers of Cush*] Cush was the name of the Nile valley, south of the Egyptian border. It corresponds in general to the Greek 'Ethiopia.' The rivers referred to are the branches of the Nile that traverse the most southern portion of the region; viz. the Atbara, the Astasobas, the Astapus or Blue Nile, and the Bahr-el-Abjadh or White Nile; *cf.* Is. 18^{1-7}. The exact force of the preposition, whether 'in the regions beyond' or 'from the regions beyond,' is in doubt. The former sense is much the more common (*e. g.* Is. 18^{1} Dt. 30^{13} 1 K. 4^{12}), but the latter is also clearly established (*e. g.* Jb. 1^{19} 2 Ch. 20^{2}). In view of Is. $19^{19\,\text{ff.}}$, the preference here may be given to the first rendering.—*The princes*(?) *of the daughter of Put*(?)] For 'he-goats' as a figurative appellation of chiefs or leaders, *cf.* Is. 14^{9} Ez. 34^{17}. Put is commonly named alongside of Cush and seems to have been a neighbouring state. As located by this verse, it would lie south of Cush and thus be representative to the Hebrew mind of the most distant lands. The foregoing translation rests upon a wholly conjectural correction of the text; but it is the most attractive correction thus far offered. 𝔐 is quite generally considered unintelligible.* Some seek to solve the problem by omitting these words wholly as a gloss.† But this does not make them any more intelligible, on the one hand; and, on the other, it renders the line of which they are a part somewhat short. RV. renders "my suppliants, even the daughter of my dispersed," which is made the subject of the following verb.‡ RVm. renders in the same way, but makes the phrase the object of the following verb.§ Another rendering which takes it as subject is, "the suppliants of the daughter of my dispersed,"**

---

* *Contra* Siev..

† *Cf.* Giesebrecht, *Die alttestamentliche Schätzung des Gottesnamens* (1901), 94 *ff.*.

---

[*] So *e. g.* Ew., Schw., We., Oort, Now., Marti, Hal., Dr., van H., Fag., Roth., Du..

[†] So Schw., Wkl.$^{\text{Unt.}}$, 149 *f.*, van H., Fag.. *Cf.* Or. who suggests that בַּת פּוּצַי may be a gloss on עֲתָרַי.

[‡] So also 𝔙, Lu., Rosenm., Hi., Hd..

[§] So also Ke.; *cf.* Is. 66^{20}.

[**] GASm..

i. e. the heathen neighbours of the exiled Jews, who now seek the favour of those they once oppressed and despised. For the difficulties confronting these renderings, *v. i.*. Hommel finds in the words ordinarily rendered "daughter of my dispersed" the name of a South Arabian species of incense, which the nations are represented as bringing to Yahweh.—*Will lead along my offerings*] *i. e.* bear offerings to Yahweh in processions, a common custom in the worship of Semitic gods.* There is no need to consider the princes as bringing offerings to Jerusalem; they are rather to bring gifts to Yahweh's altars wherever they may be, whether at Jerusalem or in Ethiopia itself; *cf.* Is. $19^{18 \text{ ff.}}$ and the fact that there was a temple of Yahu in Elephantinê. The offerings will testify to the recognition of Yahweh's kingship over the nations; *cf.* 1 S. 10^{27} 2 S. 8^{2}. With the verse as a whole, *cf.* 2^{11} Is. 45^{14} 66^{20} Zc. 8^{23} Ps. $72^{10 \text{ f.}}$.

The original oracle is now resumed in **Str. II** which predicts a work of cleansing among Yahweh's people.—**11.** *In that day, thou wilt not be shamed by any of thy deeds wherein thou hast transgressed against me*] *Cf.* Ez. 39^{26}. The pious community in Jerusalem is addressed. The day spoken of is that announced in v. ^{8}, the day upon which the heathen are to be judged. The word 'shame' is used in Hebrew in two senses, a subjective and an objective one. Those who find here the subjective sense 'feel shame' explain the statement in various ways; *e. g.* (1) Jerusalem will no more be ashamed of her past sins, the very memory of them having been obliterated;† (2) such crimes as Jerusalem now commits she will not then do, and thus will have no cause for shame.‡ Against (1) may be adduced the fact that the memory of sin and failure is a most effective agency in producing the humility desiderated in the latter part of the verse, and the query, why did not the prophet say "thou wilt no longer remember," if that was what he meant? As to (2), it was hardly necessary for the prophet to make such a self-evident statement as is involved in this interpretation. It is better to interpret it objectively, viz. Jerusalem will not be put to shame in the coming age, because the conditions that have occasioned such public humiliation in the past will have given place to new and wholesome ones; the wicked will have been removed.* Disaster and suffering were interpreted as signs of Yahweh's anger against sin, hence such afflictions were as brand-marks of shame, known and read of all men. *Cf.* Is. 54^4 65^{16}. The removal of the relative clause as a gloss is unwarranted, since it takes away the necessary definition of the 'deeds' mentioned; metrical necessities cannot outweigh the requirements of the thought.†—*For then I will take away thy proudly exulting ones from the midst of thee*] In Is. 13^3, this designation is applied to the Medes as the warriors of Yahweh; here it denotes the officials, viz. priests, prophets, judges, etc., who jauntily ignore the requirements of Yahweh and rejoice in their own self-sufficiency. A process of sifting will be resolutely carried through.—*And thou wilt no more be haughty in my holy mountain*] Haughtiness, arrogance and pride were always offensive to the prophets who without exception were the friends and champions of the poor and lowly. The mountain in question is, of course, Mt. Zion, made holy by the presence of Yahweh in his temple.—**12a.** *And I will leave in the midst of thee a people humble and poor*] It is safe to say that weakness and poverty do not exhaust the content of these adjectives, even if they form a large part of it. It is not so much Israel's standing on battle-fields, in markets, and at courts that is meant, as a state of mind and heart, an attitude toward God; *cf.* Mi. 6^8 Is. 66^2 Mt. $5^{3. 5}$. This conception of the ideal religious life came late in Israel's history; *v.* on 2^3.

---

* *V. e. g.* Naville, *Deir el-Bahari* (Egypt Exploration Fund), where are reproduced the scenes from the temple wall showing the products of the expedition to Punt being presented to the god Amon.

† Ew., Dav..

‡ Mau., Ke., Or..

Str. III describes the Israel that is to be as the exact opposite of the Israel that now is. Schw. felt the need of supplementing v. ^{12b} in some way; hence supposed that something had been lost at the end of the verse. This supposition becomes unnecessary, if v. ^{12b} be read with v. ^{13a}, a proceeding which secures excellent sense and at the same time gives lines 1 and 2 of **Str. III** their proper length.‡—**12b, 13.** *The remnant of Israel will take refuge in the name of Yahweh*] They will recognise Yahweh as their only but all-sufficient source of strength. The Israelites of the past have at times scouted Yahweh's aid and when shaken out of their own self-sufficiency by the shock of great calamities have turned to the gods of the nations for help rather than to their own God; *cf.* 1[5. 6. 12]. As a consequence of this positive confidence in Yahweh, the Israel of the days to come will not be guilty of offences such as have characterised its past.—*They will not do wickedness, nor will they speak lies*] An abiding faith in Yahweh will keep them from the perverse and devious ways of the ungodly. Sure of themselves and their God, they will have no need to take refuge in lies. This writer evidently sees a vital connection between morality and religion.—*Nor will there be found in their mouths a deceitful tongue*] The emphasis laid here upon this vice is a reflection of the fact that lying and cheating have always been most prevalent practices among Semites and are, even at the present day.—*For they will feed and lie down with none to disturb them*] A common figure in prophecy; *cf.* Is. 14[30] 17[2] Ez. 34[25. 28] Mi. 4[4] 7[14] Jb. 11[19]. Lying and kindred sins are largely due to fear and need. In the coming age, such incentives to vice will be lacking, for all will enjoy abundance and none will be left who could or would do injury to any.

---

* Hd., Stei., Now., Marti.

† *Contra* Fag..

‡ So Marti, Now.^{K}, Fag., Roth., Du..

The strophical divisions of this poem are clearly indicated by the logical analysis of the progress of the thought. The poetic lines are just as clearly shown by the movement of the parallelism. The rhythm is prevailingly hexameter, with a few descents to pentameter.

Vv. [9. 10] constitute a disturbing element within this oracle. They seem to be foreign to, if not also later than, their present context; so Now., GASm., BDB., Grimm (*Lt. App.* 87 *ff.*), Dr., Cor., Bu.[Gesch.], Marti, Siev., Beer, Fag.. The main ground for this opinion is the fact that they manifest a totally different attitude toward the nations from that of v. [8]. In the latter, the nations are destined to be destroyed; here they are to be converted. Moreover, the 'for' of v. [9] is without any significance in the present context; the purification of the nations is surely no reason for their destruction; nor can it justify the 'wait' of v. [8] unless the purification is to involve the punishment of the wicked within Israel as well as that of those without. But this is not stated and is too important a statement to have been taken for granted. Still further, the elimination of vv. [9. 10] leaves a good connection between vv. [8] and [11].

The date of vv. [8-13] is open to discussion. Some scholars regard them, with or without vv. [9. 10], as the work of Zephaniah: so *e. g.* Dav., Now., GASm., Or., Hal., Dr., Cor., Bu.$^{\text{Gesch.}}$, van H., Stk.. Others assign them to a later age; so *e. g.* Sta.$^{\text{GVI}}$, 644 *f.*, Schw., We., Marti, Siev., Beer, Fag., Roth., Du., Kent. The argument for their genuineness rests largely upon what seems an impossible exegesis of v. [8]; viz. that it is the logical continuation of v. [7] and is addressed to the pious in Judah, who are bidden to wait until Yahweh shall have gathered the nations and by means of them inflicted punishment upon the ungodly oppressors within Judah itself. But this involves passing over גוים and ממלכות, the nearest and the most natural antecedents of the pronoun in עליהם and seeking its antecedent in the distant השכימו השחיתו of v. [7]. Naturally interpreted, v. [8] becomes a promise to Judah that the nations who have oppressed her will be destroyed. Judah, on the other hand, is to be cleansed and saved (vv. [11. 12]). This sharp discrimination between the heathen and Judah does not appear in Zephaniah's picture of the day of doom in ch. 1. Likewise, the characterisation of Judah as 'humble and poor' (v. [12]) holds up an ideal of religion which belongs to Israel's last days (*cf.* 2[3]). The frank recognition of the doctrine of the remnant also belongs in the later period of Israelitish life. The abrupt manner in which the trend of thought is changed in v. [8] is a further indication that the present consecution of thought is not the original one. After v. [7], we expect an announcement of dire disaster upon the wicked Israelites; but instead we get such an announcement against the nations. Not improbably, the original conclusion of this oracle, expressing some unfavourable judgment upon Judah, was deliberately dropped and the present passage put in its place; *cf.* Grimm, *Lt. App.* 87 *ff.*.

8. According to the Mas., this is the only verse in the OT. which contains all the letters of the Heb. alphabet, including the final forms. שׂ, however, does not appear here.—הכו] 𝔊 𝔙 = חַכִּי; so Marti, Now.^{K}, Siev., Fag., Roth..—עַד] Rd. לְעֵד, with 𝔊 𝔖 𝔗; so Hi., Schw., Gr., We., GASm., Now., Marti, Or., van H., Roth., Fag., Du.. 𝔙 *in futurum.* Hal. לְעָרְךָ.—לאסף] 𝔊 *συναγωγάς.*—לקבצי] Rd. לְקַבֵּץ, with 𝔊 *τοῦ εἰσδέξασθαι* and 𝔖 𝔗; so Schw., We., Now., Marti, Dr., Siev., van H., Fag.. Gr. לְקַבֵּץ.—ממלכות] 𝔊 *βασιλεῖς.*—זעמי] 𝔊$^{\text{BAQΓ}}$ HP. 48, 153, 233 om.; so GASm..—**9.** אהפך אל] = הפך לְ, 1 S. 10[9], *i. e.* 'bestow upon by way of exchange.'—אל עמים] Gr. אֶל עַמִּי. Schw. לְעַמִּים. Bach. כל עמים.—שפה] Bach. משפחה.—ברורה] 𝔊 *εἰς γενεὰν αὐτῆς* = בְּדוֹרָהּ. Aq. Θ *ἐξειλεγμένον*; *cf.* 𝔙 *electum;* so 𝔖.—כלם] 𝔊 *πάντας.* 𝔙 *omnes.*—בשם י׳] Marti, בִּשְׁמִי; so Fag., Roth..—לעבדו] Marti, לְעָבְדִי; so Fag.. Roth. לעבד.—שכם] 𝔊 𝔖 = *yoke.*—**10.** עתרי בת פוצי] Rd. עֲתָרַי בַּת פּוּט; so Hal.. 𝔊$^{\text{B}}$ HP. 48, *προσδέξομαι ἐν διεσπαρμένοις μου.* 𝔊$^{\text{A. Q}}$ HP. 26, 49, 106, 130, 153, 198, 233, 239, 311 and 𝔖 om.; 𝔖$^{\text{H}}$ has it in marg.; HP. 22, 97, 238 have it under asterisk. 𝔊$^{\aleph\text{ c. a (vid.)}}$ (*postea ras*) *προσδέξομαι* (HP. 62, 86, 147, *προσδέχομαι*) *τοὺς ἱκετεύοντάς με* (95, 185, *μετὰ*) *τῶν ἐσπαρμένων* (36, 51, 132, 228, 240, *διεσπαρμένων*). Σ *ἱκετεύοντά με* *τέκνα τῶν διεσκορπισμένων ὑπ' ἐμοῦ.* 𝔙 *inde supplices mei, filii dispersorum meorum.* Gr. עֲשִׁירֵי וגו׳. Schw. אַחַר דְּנְפוּצוֹ. Bach. יֶעְתְּקוּ ב׳ רוּצַי. Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, יעתרי לי בְּנְפוּצַי. Ew. כּוּט for פוּצי; so Gr., Dav. (?), Hal., Dr. (?). Roth. יַקְרִיבוּ זִבְחִי. Ew. connects עתרי with עָתַר (Ez. 8^{11}), which seems to mean 'odour,' and renders 'my perfumes,' which serves as the obj. of the vb. with מ׳ in apposition. But the textual basis of Ez. 8^{11} is too uncertain to permit its use as a guide to interpretation here. The usual rendering 'my suppliants' derives it from עתר 'to pray,' a well-known vb.. But the ambiguity as to the persons so designated and the fact that this form occurs nowhere else make it more probable that the text is here at fault. The usual rendering of בת פוצי, viz. 'daughter of my dispersed ones,' is met by three difficulties; (1) בת in such titles is regularly connected only with proper names, *e. g.* בת כשדים, בת ירושלם, בת ציון, בת גלים; the notable exception, בַּת עַמִּי, frequent in Jeremiah, is not closely analogous to this case where the governing noun is in the pl.; (2) the pass. prtc., פוּץ, nowhere else occurs; (3) the uncertainty as to whether בת פ׳ is subj. or obj. of the vb. The reading פוּט involves an error in only one letter and dittog. of the initial י of the foll. vb.. בת here may be taken as 'daughter' (*cf.* 'd. of the Chaldeans') or as = בית, *cf.* בית שמש, בית ערן, *bît Yakîn*, etc.; בית and בת are at times confused (*cf.* Qr. and Kt. in Is. 10^{32}). Hommel's interpretation of ב׳ פ׳ (*v. s.*) rests upon three contentions; (1) that Cush is not Ethiopia, but a region in S. Arabia; (2) that ב׳ פ׳ follows the analogy of other Semitic plant-names (*e. g. bint el 'inab* = 'wine'; *banât en-nâr* = 'nettle'), is to be connected with the S. Ar. אפטי (found in Glaser, No. 1083, l. 4, between the names of two kinds of incense), and is the name of some special variety of incense; and (3) that the √ עתר originally meant 'to offer incense.' On this basis, the rendering would be, 'my incense-bearers will bring a costly kind of incense as my offering.' But the identification of Cush with S. Arabia finds little favour because of insufficient evidence (so Kö., *Fünf neue arab. Landschaftsnamen* [1902] and Ed. Meyer, *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme* [1906], 315–317; *contra* Glaser, *Skizze d. Gesch. u. Geogr. Arabiens*, II, 33. Hommel, *Aufsätze und Abhandlungen*, No. VIII; Che. art. *Cush*, *EB.*; Wkl. *KAT.*^{3}, 137, 144); the use of בת with a plant-name is without analogy in Heb.; and the connection of עתרי with incense has no support in Heb. outside of the dubious passage, Ez. 3^{8}.—מנחתי] Rd. מִנְחָתִי, with 𝔊; so Ew., Schw..—**11.** ביום ה׳] 𝔖 joins to v. ^{10} and takes first clause as a question, "wilt thou not blush, etc.?"—לא] Stei., Hal. לֹא.—לגבהה] An inf. cstr. in ה ָ; *cf.* Ges.$^{\S 45d}$.—**12.** וחסו] Gr. וְחָסַי; so We., Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, Now..—בשם י׳] Roth. בְּשְׁמִי.—**13.** שארית י׳] 𝔊 joins with v. ^{12} as subj. of חסו.—לא יע׳] 𝔊 = ולא יע׳.

§ 9. THE WORLD-WIDE RENOWN OF REDEEMED ISRAEL (3^{14-20}).

In two strs. of unequal length, a late writer contrasts the Israel of the coming Golden Age with the Israel as known in his own time. **Str. I** bids the people of Yahweh rejoice because Yahweh is about to repulse all their foes and to favour his own people with his gracious presence henceforth (vv. $^{14.\ 15.\ 17}$). **Str. II** declares that Yahweh is to destroy all Israel's oppressors, rescue her afflicted ones and make his people the object of the world's praise (vv. $^{18.\ 19}$).

> CRY aloud, O daughter of Zion; shout, O Israel!
> Be glad and rejoice with all your heart, O daughter of Jerusalem.
> Yahweh has taken away thine opponents, he has turned aside thine enemies.
> The king of Israel is in the midst of thee; thou wilt no more see calamity.
> Yahweh, thy God, is in the midst of thee, a warrior who delivers.
> He will rejoice over thee with gladness; he will renew thee in his love.
> I WILL take away those smiting thee, and those bringing reproach upon thee.
> Behold, I will deal with all thine oppressors at that time;
> And I will deliver the halt, and the outcast I will gather.
> And I will make them a praise and renown in all the earth.

Str. I exhorts the community of the pious to rejoice enthusiastically in the evidences of the return of Yahweh's favour.—**14.** *Cry aloud, O daughter of Zion; shout, O Israel*] The context shows that joyous exclamations are called for. 'Israel' is used as the name of the chosen people of Yahweh, a common usage long after Israel proper had ceased to exist. It is quite unnecessary to change with 𝔊 to 'daughter of Jerusalem';* *cf.* Mi. 2^{12} Je. 17^{13} $50^{17\,\mathrm{ff.}}$ Ez. $4^{3.\ 13}$ $6^{2\,\mathrm{f.}}$.—*Rejoice and exult with all your heart, O daughter of Jerusalem*] *Cf.* Zc. 9^{9} Is. 54^{1}. In 'daughter' the people in general are personified. The smaller towns, villages and hamlets surrounding a large city were known as its 'daughters'; *e. g.* Nu. $21^{25.\ 32}$ 1 Ch. 2^{23}; hence it was an easy step to the thought of the inhabitants of these smaller places as the daughter of the mother city (*cf.* 2 S. 2^{19}). As Jerusalem came to occupy more and more the central place in Hebrew thought, and as the territory dwindled to smaller and smaller proportions, it became perfectly natural to represent the capital as the mother of the entire community. The same usage obtained, however, with regard to Egypt (Je. $46^{11.\,24}$), Babylon (Is. 47^{1}), Edom (La. 4^{1}), Sidon (Is. 23^{12}) and Tarshish (Is. 23^{10}).—**15.** *Yahweh has removed thine opponents; he has put thine enemies out of the way*] The prophet transports himself in imagination to the future for which he so ardently longs and proceeds to describe it as though it were actually realised. This contemplated repulse of the foe is the ground of the rejoicing called for in v. ^{14}. The afflicted and distressed condition of Judah at the time of the actual writing of this passage is thus taken for granted. 𝔐 has "thy judgments" for "thine opponents," *i. e.* the calamities that have come upon thee as penalties for thy sins. But the parallelism calls for a word denoting persons.—*The king of Israel is in the midst of thee*] The name "Yahweh" inserted in 𝔐 after "Israel" is a correct interpretation of the phrase "king of Israel" (*cf.* v. ^{17}), but is due to a glossator, as is shown by the awkwardness of the syntax and the undue length of the line. The representation of Yahweh as Israel's king is a familiar OT. view; *cf.* Is. 6^{5} 41^{21} 44^{6} Ps. 90^{15} Ob. ^{21}. Similar conceptions among other Semitic peoples are attested by the names Melek, Moloch, Milcom and the like, bestowed upon their gods; *v.* note on 1^{5}. Yahweh's presence in Israel is a guarantee of security and prosperity for his people. —*Thou wilt no more see disaster*] The Hebrew text here wavers between 'see' and 'fear'; 𝔊 and 𝔖 agree upon the former; 𝔙 follows the latter; while 𝔗 compromises by incorporating both readings in its rendering. Either reading furnishes admirable sense, the essential meaning being the same in either case. To 'see' here means to realise as a personal experience; *cf.* Je. 5^{12} Is. 44^{16}.—**16.** At this point an editorial addition appears, which does not conform to the metrical norm of the context and does introduce a foreign element between vv. ^{15} and ^{17} which naturally go together.* —*In that day, it will be said to Jerusalem, "Fear not, O Zion; let not thy hands drop"*] The language calls up the picture of a man at work upon a hard task suddenly letting go of his work in despair; *cf.* 2 S. 4^{1} Is. 13^{7} Je. 6^{24} Heb. 12^{12}.—**17.** Here the original oracle is resumed.—*Yahweh, thy God, is in the midst of thee, a warrior who*

---

* *Contra* Now..

* So Marti, Fag.; *cf.* Roth. who drops only the introductory words in the third person.

delivers] This line is chiefly an elaboration of the last line of v. ^{15}. For similar descriptions of Yahweh as a warrior bringing deliverance, *cf.* Is. 9^{6} 42^{13} Je. 14^{9} 20^{11}. The primitive conception of Yahweh as he who fights in behalf of his own people has been transformed into the thought of him who fights in behalf of the righteous, not because they are, it is true, his people, but because of their righteousness.—*He will rejoice over thee with gladness*] The imaginary stand-point is here abandoned and the writer frankly looks to the future.—*He will renew thee in his love*] 𝔐 reads, "he will be silent in his love." This has been interpreted in widely different ways. Some explain as, 'he will because of his love keep silent regarding his people's sins';* others, 'God's love will be so strong and deep as to hush motion or speech; it will be silent ecstasy';† while one explains the silence as due to Yahweh's meditative planning of good deeds toward Israel.‡ But the thought of silence seems wholly out of keeping with the spirit of the context and is definitely in conflict with the 'shout' or 'ringing cry' of the next line, though the latter is probably a later accretion. Hence recent interpreters, for the most part, have questioned the correctness of the text. Many have followed 𝔊, but with differing interpretations; *e. g.* he will do new things (*cf.* Is. 43^{19}) the like of which have not heretofore been known;§ or, he renews his love;** or, he renews himself in his love;†† or, with the rendering given above,‡‡ through the manifestations of favour inspired by his love for thee, he will restore thee to pristine vigour and glory, giving thee newness of life. This is a thought, not exactly parallel to that of the other half of the line as we should expect, but at least not wholly foreign to the context, and it is based upon a text from which 𝔐 might easily have arisen. To drop the phrase, as some do,§§ on the ground that it records the lament of a reader, does not adequately explain it, while it complicates the textual and metrical situation. Where it stands, it exactly conforms to the measure of the line.—*He will exult over thee with shouting as in the days of a festival*] This line, which incorporates the first two words of v. [18] as reproduced by 𝔊, seems to be an editorial expansion suggested by the shout of v. [14]. It adds little or nothing to the thought of the foregoing line and it reflects the late priestly point of view in its reference to the days of festal assembly. 𝔐, which opens v. [18] with the last two words of this line, presents a very difficult, if not wholly unintelligible text. RV. renders, 'them that sorrow for the solemn assembly'; AV., 'sorrowful for the feast'; and others, 'those grieved afar from the assembly,'* or 'them that are removed from the solemn assembly.'† But in addition to this ambiguity, the difficulties presented by the phrase as it stands are insuperable. It cannot be satisfactorily accounted for as a part of v. [18], for no suitable logical connection between it and the remainder of the verse can be discovered. Nor is there any apparent reason why the phrase should hold so emphatic a position at the head of the sentence. Nor can the text of 𝔊 and 𝔖 be derived from 𝔐. Consequently, some have abandoned the phrase, and indeed the whole of v. [18], as hopeless;‡ while others exercise great ingenuity in attempts to discover a satisfactory substitute. 𝔊's rendering seems to indicate the way of escape for this phrase, at least. The joyous shout on the festal occasion is, of course, that of the worshippers, and to this the joy of Yahweh is likened. This affords an interesting side-light upon the spirit and attitude of the devotees of the later priestly law.

---

* So Mau., Hd..

† So Dav., Or..

‡ Hal..

§ Hi..

** Buhl, *ZAW.* V, 183; GASm.; Du..

†† Ew..

‡‡ Gr., Now..

§§ So Bach., Marti, Siev., Now.^{K}, Fag..

Str. II represents Yahweh himself as telling how he will convert Judah's present disastrous state into one of security and glory. —**18.** *I will remove those smiting thee and those bringing reproach upon thee*] On the basis of 𝔐, the verb must be taken as governing the two words which have here been connected with v. [17]. The remainder of the verse, however, is unintelligible. RV. reads, 'who were of thee; to whom the burden upon her was a reproach."§ But 'of thee' is literally 'from thee,' a wholly un-Hebraic idiom for the expression of the idea of 'belonging to.' Furthermore, the ellipsis of the words 'to whom' is too violent and the meaning 'burden' is nowhere else applicable to משאת.

---

* Hi., Mau., Dav., Dr. (?), Or..

† Dr. (?); similarly GASm..

‡ So *e. g.* Schw., Roth..

§ Similarly AV., with the variation, 'to whom the reproach of it was a burden.'

RVm. is even less satisfactory, viz. 'they have been sorrowful for the solemn assembly which I took away from thee, for the lifting up of reproach against her.' This involves a difficult ellipsis of 'which,' an almost impossible syntax in 'they have been sorrowful,' and the insertion of the preposition 'for' before 'the lifting up.' Still another attempt to make sense is,* 'sorrowful for the feast which I broke off are certain of thee, thou land over which reproach is raised.' But 'broke off' is an unauthenticated translation of the verb, 'certain of thee' is an unparalleled Hebrew idiom and constitutes an impossible subject of the sentence, and 'is raised' is a very free rendering of 'lifting up.' Several scholars follow 𝔊 more or less closely and render, 'thy smitten ones I will gather; woe, whosoever lifts up reproach upon her.' But this is at best a rather disjointed utterance. A smoother text with an appropriate meaning is furnished in, 'I will take away from thee shame and will lift reproach from upon thee.'† But the word 'shame' is too far removed from any resemblance to 𝔐. The translation here suggested rests partly upon 𝔊 and partly upon 𝔖 and presupposes a text from which 𝔐 might have been derived with relative ease. As thus read, the line promises the overthrow of Israel's foes who have afflicted her and made her an occasion for the taunts of all the surrounding peoples. It is unnecessary to drop any part of the line or to transfer it to another context.‡—**19.** *Behold, I will deal with all thine oppressors at that time*] A statement all the more terrible for its indefinite and general character. It leaves available all the terrors of divine might for the execution of wrathful judgment upon tyranny and iniquity. For a similarly indefinite use of the idiom 'deal with,' *cf.* Ez. 22^{14} $23^{25. 29}$ Je. 21^{2} Ps. 109^{21}. The 'time' referred to is, of course, the great day of Yahweh, upon which all of Israel's wrongs are to be made right.—*And I will rescue the halt and the outcast I will gather*] *Cf.* Mi. $4^{6. 7}$ Ez. 34^{16} Zc. 11^{16}. The terms 'halt' and 'outcast' are applied to the dispersion as a whole. They suggest the homeless and crippled condition of the Hebrew people scattered among the nations, like a flock of sheep without a shepherd.—

---

* Ew..

† Marti.

‡ *Contra* Fag. who om. אספתי ממך as a gloss; and Now. and van H. who tr. the same phrase to follow ביום ההוא in v. ^{19}.

And I will make them a praise and a name in all the earth] Those who have been an object of the scorn and contempt of the nations are now to become the object of envy and renown the world over. This is a fitting climax to a prophecy of restoration.* 𝔐 adds at the end of this line the phrase, *their shame*] This has always caused difficulty to translators and interpreters. 𝔊 treated it as a verb, 'and they will be ashamed'; but this calls for a different text and, even at that, is very poorly suited to this context. 𝔙 considered it as in the construct relation with the preceding word, 'land of their shame'; but this involves an anomaly in Hebrew grammar. Others render, 'whose shame was in all the earth';† and this is the easiest disposition of the phrase, if it must be retained. But even this would naturally call for a different order of words in 𝔐 and places an unnatural emphasis upon the preceding 'them,' viz. 'I will make *them* a praise whose shame, etc.'. Hence it is, on the whole, better to omit the phrase either as a gloss or as a corrupt dittog. of בשובי את שבותיכם in v. [20].—**20.** This verse is generally recognised as being only a weak variant or repetitious expansion of v. [19],‡ which adds nothing to the thought already expressed.—*In the time when I do good to you and in the time when I gather you*] Originally, this was probably the continuation and close of the previous line. With a change to direct address, the fact is clearly indicated that the glorification of Israel is to be simultaneous with the return of the exiles now scattered throughout the known world.—*For I will make you a name and a praise among all the peoples of the earth*] A repetition of v. [19c], with a slightly different order of words and a change of person. It is likewise continued and completed by the addition of a temporal clause, viz. *When I turn your captivity before your eyes, saith Yahweh*] For the phrase 'turn your captivity, *v.* note on 2[7]. 'Before your eyes,' *i. e.* in your own lifetime; *cf.* Is. 52[8].

The measure of this section is pentameter, which is on the whole well sustained, the only irregularity being in cases where the text is in doubt. The second str. has suffered textually more than the first. Its four lines might be increased to six by the incorporation of v. $^{20a.c}$; but this is unattractive, if for no other reason than that it results in two somewhat heavy temporal clauses, in apposition one with the other, following the main clause.

---

* Du.'s proposition to close the poem with v. [18], making this a later prose supplement, seems to have little basis beyond the somewhat prosaic character of v. [19]. But v. [18] also is open to that criticism.

† So Ew., RV.; *cf.* AV., "every land where they have been put to shame."

‡ So *e. g.* Schw., We., Now., GASm., Marti, Siev., Fag., Du..

The unity of the section has been disturbed; vv. $^{16.17c.20}$ are later additions (*v. s.*). Not only so, but it is by no means certain that Str. II really belongs with Str. I. The change of person in v. ^{18} might point to a new departure in the thought; and the variation in the length of the two strs. suggests different origins for them; so *e. g.*, Roth.; *cf.* Dr.. But, on the whole, it is simpler to treat the second as complementary to the first, especially since the basis for the appearance of Yahweh speaking in his own person is laid in v. ^{17}.

The passage as a whole (vv. $^{14-20}$) is quite generally assigned to an exilic or postexilic date by modern interpreters; the defenders of Zephaniah's authorship are now few, viz. Kö. *Einl.*; WRS., art. *Zephaniah*, *EB.*; Dr. (?); Or., and Stk.. On the side of late origin may be cited, Oort, *Godgeleerde Bijdragen*, 1865, pp. 812 *ff.*; Sta.^{GVI}, 644; Kue. *Einl.* § 78; We.; Schw.; Bu. *SK.* 1893, pp. 393 *ff.* and *Gesch.* 89; Cor.; Wildeboer, *Litt. d. AT.*; Dav.; Now.; GASm.; Grimm, *Lt. App.* 95 *ff.*; Baudissin, *Einl.*; Strack, *Einl.*^{6}; Beer; Roth.; Du.; Kent. The considerations in favour of the late date are convincing. Threats of punishment give way here wholly to promises of peace and pardon. The cessation of Israel's affliction is decreed; the restoration of the favour of 'י is assured. The exile and dispersion are taken for granted as well-known facts. The return of exiles is predicted. The whole spirit and tone of the section is that of Zc. 14 and the so-called Deutero-Isaiah. The total severance of the fulfilment of the promises here made from all historical agencies is characteristic of Messianic and eschatological utterances of later times.

1. הריעו] This use of the pl. as over against the sg. in רני and שמחי is due to the fact that ישראל was not so keenly felt to be an individual and personal epithet as were בת ציון and בת ירושלם; the collective idea was more in evidence.—ישראל] 𝔊 = בת ירושלם; so Now..—**15.** משפטיך] Rd. מְשֹׁפְטַיִךְ, with 𝔗; so We., Oort$^{Em.}$, Now., Marti, Siev., Fag., Roth.. Hal. מְשַׁפְּטֵךְ. The objection that a forensic term like 'מְשֹׁ is a hardly suitable designation of Israel's enemies is not weighty in view of Jb. 9^{15} and the bitterness and wrath that Job attributes to his 'opponent' who is none less than 'י himself, the source of all Job's sufferings.—פנה] 𝔊 *λελύτρωταί σε*; hence Schw. פרך מִן. Schw. objects to 𝔐 on the ground that in its seven other occurrences פנה always means 'make clear,' 'prepare,' a meaning not suitable here. But 𝔖 𝔗 𝔙 approve the meaning 'remove,' 'take away'; this is a legitimate and natural development of the primary meaning, 'turn'; and it is not so certain that this is not the meaning required in Ps. 80^{10}.—איבך] Rd. אֹיְבַיִךְ, with many mss. of Kenn.

and de R., 𝔊 𝔖 𝔙 𝔗.—מלך] 𝔊$^{\aleph\text{ c. a (vid.). c. b. A.Y}}$ HP. 22, 26, 36, 42, 51, 62, 86, 95, 106, 185, 228, 238, 240, 311, *βασιλεύσει* = מָלַךְ; so Marti, Siev., Fag., Roth..—ישראל] Marti, Fag., Roth. om.. Siev. tr. to foll. בקרבך.—תראי] 𝔊 *οὐκ ὄψῃ* = 𝔐; so 𝔖. 𝔙 *non timebis* = תיראי; so Bab. Cod., 38 mss. of Kenn. and 31 of de R and the Baer and Ginsburg Bibles. 𝔗 *thou shalt not be alarmed at the sight of evil.*—**16.** ויאמר] 𝔊 *ἐρεῖ κύριος.*—אל היראי] 𝔊 positively, *θάρσει.*—**17.** יושיע] Adjectival impf. = a relative clause. 𝔊 *σώσει σε.* 𝔖 treats as prtc .—ישיש עליך בש׳] 𝔊 *ἐπάξει ἐπὶ σὲ εὐφροσύνην.*—יחריש] Rd. יְחַדֵּשׁ, with 𝔊 *καινιεῖ σε* and 𝔖; so Buhl (*ZAW*. V, 183), GASm., Dr., Roth., Du.. 𝔙 *silebit.* Houb. יַחְרִישׁ; so New., Ew., Hi.. Gr. יְחַדֶּשְׁךָ; so Now.. Bach. יְרַחֵם איש. Schw. יחדה (?); so Oort$^{\text{Em}}$.. Müller (*SK*. 1907, p. 310), יְרַחֵשׁ = 'he roars,' or 'effervesces,' 'boils over' (*cf.* Ps. 45^{2}); so van H..—באהבתו] Some *del.* בְּ. The force of ב in בשמחה and ברנה seems to call for the meaning 'with' or 'in' here also. This is supported by the fact that חרש does not elsewhere take an obj. with בְּ.—עליך] Fag. om..—**18.** נוגי ממועד] Rd. כְּיוֹם מוֹעֵד and join it to v. ^{17}, with 𝔊 *ὡς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἑορτῆς* and 𝔖 𝔗; so Buhl (*ZAW*. V, 183), Schw. (?), Gr., Oort$^{\text{Em}}$., Now., Marti, van H., Fag., Du.. 𝔙 *nugas, qui a lege recesserant.* Hal. מוּגֵי ממ׳, Hoph. prtc. of √ יגה; so Dr. (?). Bach. [וְכָרַתִּי] בּוֹגְרִים ממ׳. Siev. נִגְשַׂיִךְ ממ׳. 𝔙's *nugas* is an etymology suggested by the resemblance in sound, but without any basis in fact. The form in 𝔐 must be Niph. prtc. √ יגה, with an obtusion of וּ to וֹ; Ges.$^{\S\,69\,t}$. The fem. נוגות occurs in La. 1^{4}. The form might also be derived from another יגה which in Hiph. = 'push away'; but no Niph. form of this root occurs elsewhere, nor is the only known form of the Hiph. (2 S. 20^{13}) absolutely guaranteed textually. *Cf.* Kö. I, 582.—אספתי] 𝔊 = וְא׳; 9 mss. of HP. = *καὶ συνάξει.* 𝔖 *I will cause to pass away.* Bach. אֲסַפְּתִים.—ממך] Rd. מַכַּיִךְ, with 𝔊 *τοὺς συντετριμμένους* (+ *σου* 𝔊$^{\text{AQ}}$); so Schw. (?), Now., van H.. 𝔙. *quia ex te.* Hal. עַמֵּךְ. Buhl (*l. c.*), מְאַמֵּךְ. The only other case cited for the prep. מן as = 'belonging to' or 'springing from' is Is. 58^{12} and there the text is almost certainly corrupt as it is here. The מישראל of Ezr. 2^{59} is not quite analogous.—היו משאת] Rd. הַמַּשִּׁיאִים; *cf.* 𝔖 *those who were speaking.* 𝔊 *οὐαὶ τίς ἔλαβεν* = הוי מי נשא. Aq. *οἴ*; so 𝔗. 𝔙 *erant ut non ultra habeas.* 𝔊's הוי is adopted by Buhl, Schw., Oort$^{\text{Em}}$., Now., van H., Fag.. We. מִשְּׂאֵת. Hal. מְשֵׂאתֵךְ; so Dr. (?). Buhl, מִי יִשָּׂא; so Now., van H., Fag.. Marti, כְּלִמָּה וְנָשָׂאתִי; so Now.$^{\text{K}}$ (?), Roth. (?). Siev. הָיוּ מְשַׂנְאַיִךְ. The rendering of מש׳ ע׳ by "the burden upon her" is liable to three objections; (1) the anarthrous character of מ׳; (2) the elision of the relative pronoun and the copula; (3) the meaning 'burden' is required nowhere else. The Hiph. prtc. here proposed is not elsewhere found; but the use of the Hiph. is assured by Lv. 22^{16}, even if 2 S. 17^{13} be unsafe. The literal rendering with this reading becomes, 'those who smote thee and those who caused (others) to lift up reproach against thee.'—ה ־ל] Rd.

עָלַיִךְ, with 𝔖, Bab. Cod., and several mss. of Kenn. and de R.; so Oort$^{Em.}$, Fag.. We. עֲלֵיהֶם; so Hal..—**19.** עֹשֶׂה] 𝔙 *interficiam.* Gr. adds כָּלָה; so Now., Marti, Siev., Fag.. Van H. tr. כל] to foll. 'ע and reads it כָּלָה.—את כל מעניך] 𝔊 *ἐν σοὶ ἕνεκεν σοῦ*; hence GASm. אֶת־כֹּל לְמַעֲנֵךְ; similarly Du.. 𝔊^{Y} *ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ* (so 9 mss. of HP.). Roth. אִתָּךְ לְמַעֲנִי. 𝔖 *them all humble in the midst of thee.*—בעת ההיא] 𝔊$^{BA.,QY}$ HP. 48, 228, add λέγει Κύριος. 𝔖^{H} under asterisk. Marti om. as dittog. from v. ^{20}; so Siev., Fag..—ושמתים] 𝔊^{אB} om.. Nö. *Götting. gel. Anzeig.* 1871, p. 897, *del.* ם and makes foll. 'בש obj..—שם] 𝔊 pl..—בשתם] 𝔊 *καταισχυνθήσονται.* 𝔖 om.; so Schw., We., Dav., Now., GASm., Oort$^{Em.}$, Dr. (?), Marti, Siev., Fag., Roth., Du.. Gr. inserts עַתָּה before 'ב; so Hal., Dr. (?). As parallel cases for a cstr. with the art., there have been cited Jos. 3^{17} 8^{11} 1 S. 2^{13} 2 K. 7^{13} Je. 25^{26}; but in every one of these instances there is good ground for suspecting corruption of the text.—**20.** בעת ההיא אביא] Rd., with Buhl, בְּעֵת היטיבי (*cf.* 𝔊 *ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ ὅταν καλῶς ὑμῖν ποιήσω*); so also van H.. *Cf.* Schw. (?), בעת ההיא איטיב; so Gr., GASm., Oort$^{Em.}$, Du..—ובעת קבצי] Rd. 'וּבְעֵת ק, with Buhl. 𝔊 *καὶ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ὅταν εἰσδέξομαι.* Schw. ובעת ההיא אקבץ; so We., Now., GASm. (?), Marti, Dr., Siev., Fag., Roth.. It is difficult to see how so easy and natural a reading as this latter one could have given way to the rarer idiom suggested by 𝔐, which bears the stamp of originality. If this be correct, there is a strong presupposition in favour of the similar reading here adopted for the first part of the line.—שבותיכם] Rd. שְׁבוּתְכֶם, with 𝔊 𝔖 𝔙 and 14 Heb. mss.; so Schw., We., Now., GASm., BDB., Marti, Fag..

A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON NAHUM

INTRODUCTION TO THE BOOK OF NAHUM.

§ 1. THE BOOK OF NAHUM.

Its Contents.

The first section of the book of Nahum as it now stands sets forth the avenging wrath of Yahweh (1^{2-10}). Though manifested with reluctance, yet its exhibition against the ungodly is inevitable. Its outpouring throws the physical universe into convulsions, but Yahweh furnishes shelter from his wrath to those that trust in him. Those that oppose him are irrevocably destroyed. The second section (1^{11}–2^{3}) alternates between words of reproach or threatening against some unnamed foe (supposedly Nineveh) and promises of comfort and deliverance to Judah.

The remainder of the book deals with one subject, viz. the approaching destruction of Nineveh. The material, however, divides itself into two sections, viz. 2^{4-14} and 3^{1-19}. The former of these begins so abruptly as to suggest that the original beginning of the section is either lost or else embodied in 1^{11}–2^{3}. The section as a whole gives a vivid picture of the attack upon Nineveh, the capture, the weeping of the women, the flight of the defenders and the plunder of the city's treasures and closes with a taunt-song contrasting Nineveh's past tyranny and robbery with the waste and desolate state which awaits her. The closing section (3^{1-9}), addressed directly to the doomed city, first of all presents concretely the awful state in store for her. The reason for this is then assigned as lying in her treacherous treatment of other nations. Hence she is to be made the butt of the scorn of these nations. If she flatters herself that she is impregnable, let her recall the overthrow of the invincible Thebes. Panic will seize her defenders and she will fall an easy prey. No matter how zealous she be in strengthening her defences, fire and sword will destroy her, and her population will scatter like a brood of locusts, leaving behind no clue. Her destruction will be total and final and will call forth the plaudits of all peoples.

Its Unity.

No question was raised as to the unity of the book of Nahum until the appearance of Gunk.'s article in *ZAW.* for 1893. Berthold had, indeed, in 1814* asserted that the three chapters were independent one of another and claimed that, though from one author, they were separated by slight intervals of time. Gunk., however, asserted not only the independence of ch. 1, but also its origin from a different hand. Essentially this view has been followed by nearly all succeeding interpreters.† The considerations pointing to another and later origin for 1^{2-10} are as follows. The acrostic form in which the material is cast seems too mechanical and artificial for a poet of Nahum's vigour and freshness. The psalm-like character of the language, first noted by We., is in marked contrast with the language of prophecy. The theological and abstract nature of the thought of $1^{2\text{ ff.}}$ is strikingly different from that of the concrete and vivid tableaux of chs. 2 and 3. This is the language of reflection, not that of prophetic passion forged in the heat of current controversy and hope. The descriptions here might be applied to almost any foe; they lack the specific detail of chs. 2 and 3. In $1^{4\text{ f.}}$, the wrath of Yahweh is let loose upon Bashan, Carmel and Lebanon; whereas, in chs. 2 and 3, Nineveh is the sole object of his anger. The indefinite and eschatological character of the acrostic distinguishes it sharply from genuine prophecy, such as is found in chs. 2 and 3. It is true, as is urged by GASm., that vagueness and eschatological tone are found in Zephaniah; but there the eschatological material leads naturally and smoothly to the announcement of the coming historical events which are to fulfil the expectations of the prophet. Here, the eschatological theophany is without practical issue and lacks connection of any kind with the final catastrophe, which is historically mediated.

---

* *Einl.*, cited by Hap..

† Exceptions are Dav., who refrains from a decision; GASm., who admits "many provocations to belief" in the late origin of ch. 1, but does not regard it as proved, and therefore leaves the question open; and Or., who ascribes the acrostic to Nahum whom he believes to have used so much of an earlier poem of his own as seemed appropriate here.

Various hypotheses have been formulated as to the way in which the acrostic became a part of the book of Nahum. It goes without saying that the union was deliberate rather than accidental. But, was the acrostic as it now stands originally written as an introduction to Nahum? Or was it, though written for this purpose, thoroughly revised at some later date?* Or again, is it a poem found ready at hand and forced into this service by some editor who failed to appreciate its acrostic form?† These questions cannot be answered with any high degree of assurance; but the last mentioned hypothesis seems the more likely; for the introduction does not fit sufficiently well to have been made to order.

From the remainder of ch. 1, viz. vv. $^{11-15}$, a portion consisting of vv. $^{12.\ 13.\ 15}$ is to be joined with chap. 2 and set aside as an interpolation, which balances the foregoing judgment upon the heathen with an announcement of deliverance for the people of God. The genuine Nahum first appears in $1^{11.\ 14}$ $2^{1.\ 3}$. This, however, is scarcely to be accepted as the original opening of the prophecy. It is altogether too abrupt and broken. The probability is that the acrostic has displaced some material which formed the original beginning of the prophecy.

The only other extraneous matter in the book is found at the very end, viz. $3^{18.\ 19}$. These verses were suspected as later than the rest by We.; and the fact that they seem to reflect the fall of Nineveh, together with their variation from the str. norm of their context, makes it probable that We. suspected the truth.

One other portion, viz. 2^{14}–3^{7}, has been suspected of having been subjected to a thorough working over.‡ The grounds alleged for this suspicion were (1) the probability that the original metre was elegiac, (2) the theological colouring which was thought to recall the style of Ezekiel. But the only theological element in the passage is the statement that Nineveh's downfall is due to Yahweh's indignation against her sins. The fact that elsewhere Nahum says nothing directly about Yahweh's part in the punishment surely does not prohibit him from speaking of it here, especially in view of the fact that the idea is one characteristic of all genuine prophecy.

---

* So We..

† So Now., Dr., van H., Kennedy.

‡ Viz. by Bu. *EB.* (1902); but the passage remains unchallenged in his *Gesch.* (1906).

Attempts to dissolve Nahum into its original elements and to reconstruct these in combinations wholly new and radically different from that found in 𝔐 have been made by Hap. and Hpt.. The former regards ch. 1 as having been constituted of two different sections, viz. 1^{2-10} and 1^{12b-15}. These were worked over and cemented together by $1^{11.\,12a}$. Chs. 2 and 3 Hap. declares to be independent of ch. 1 and each independent of the other, the three chapters having been written by three different hands. This view finds no adequate support in the text and is cited merely as a curiosity of interpretation.

Hpt. designates the book as a liturgical collection of four poems, the first two belonging to the Maccabaean age and the last two to the days immediately preceding the fall of Nineveh in 606 B.C.. The materials belonging to the four poems are: (1) 1^{2-10}; (2) 3^{1-7} $1^{11.\,14}$ 2^{1} $1^{12.\,15}$ 2^{2}; (3) 3^{8-15}; (4) $3^{2.\,3}$ $2^{3a-5.\,8b.\,6-8a.\,7.\,9-12}$. In support of this extraordinary *bouleversement*, not a shred of argument is proffered. Something more than a mere *ipse dixit* is needed to render such a proposal worthy of serious consideration.

Its Poetic Form.

For the last thirty years, the poetic form of ch. 1 has been the subject of repeated consideration. The remainder of the book has received relatively little attention. Bick. first presented a reconstruction of ch. 1 showing its acrostic character.* By an ingenious but fanciful method, he found the acrostic completed within 1^{2-10} (*v.* following commentary). Gunk.† abandoned the attempt to discover the complete alphabet in the initial letters of the lines in vv. $^{2-10}$ and, on the basis of We.'s elimination of $1^{13.15}$ 2^{2} as an interpolation, blazed a new path by carrying the acrostic on through ch. 1 and into the beginning of ch. 2, its constituent elements being $1^{2-10.\ 13.\ 14}$ $2^{1.\ 3}$. This new trail was followed by Bick. in his latest publication on the subject,* but with a somewhat different arrangement of the materials, vv. $^{3a.\ 2c.\ d}$ being placed between vv. ^{9} and ^{10} and some new readings being proposed. Gunk. in turn† accepted some of Bick.'s modifications and supplied the missing נ and ק lines of which he had despaired in 1893. Now. in his first edition (1897) accepted in essence the conclusions of Gunk. and Bick.‡ Dav. (1896) and Dr.§ both assumed a sceptical attitude toward the existence of an acrostic; while GASm. (1898) recognised the traces of an alphabetical arrangement as far as 1^{9}, though questioning the success of the preceding efforts to restore it. We. (1898) granted the alphabetic structure of vv. $^{2-8}$, but denied any further trace of it.** Gray†† admitted the existence of the acrostic throughout ch. 1 and on into ch. 2, but regarded attempts to restore it beyond 1^{9} as wholly conjectural.‡‡ Siev. likewise abandoned the effort to restore the acrostic beyond 1^{9}, but declared that the rhythm showed that the acrostic was not continued in ch. 2.§§ Arn. (1901) presented the view that the presence of the acrostic is due to the work of a redactor, who cited it from memory but forgot the latter part of it together with its original order and the fact that it was an acrostic; consequently it can be recovered only in vv. $^{2-10.\ 12b}$ and there only by dint of much change of text and transposition of words and clauses. Marti (1904) too limits the acrostic to vv. $^{2-10}$ and declares it to be a torso, the balance of which is irrecoverable.*** Van H. renews the attempt to complete the acrostic within 1^{2}–2^{3}, but the many violent emendations and transpositions involved in his reconstruction of the latter part mark his effort as only an academic exercise.

---

* In *ZDMG.* XXXIV (1880), 559 *ff.*; similarly also in *Carmina Veteris Testamenti metrice* (1882), and on vv. $^{7-10}$ in *Zeitschrift für Kathol. Theologie* for 1886, pp. 550 *ff.*.

† In *ZAW.* XIII (1893).

In the following commentary, the acrostic is carried only through

---

* *Beiträge zur semit. Metrik* (1894).

† *Schöpfung und Chaos* (1895), pp. 102 *f*..

‡ So also Hap. *Psalm Na.* (1900) and *Das Buch Na.* (1902).

§ In *Expos. T.* 1897.

** So also Now.^{2} (1903); Löhr, *ZAW*. XXV (1905), 174 *f*..

†† *Exp.* for 1898, pp. 207–220.

‡‡ So also Kennedy in *DB.* art. *Nahum* (1900). Dr. (1906) follows Gray's reconstruction of vv. $^{2-9}$, but questions the acrostic character of vv. $^{10\text{ ff.}}$.

§§ *Metrische Studien* (1901).

*** So also Hpt. *JBL.* XXVI (1907) and *ZDMG.* LXI (1907), 275–97; Stk. (1908); Du. (1910).

1^{10} and the reconstruction is substantially that of Gunk. as emended by Bick., Marti, *et al.*. Hexameter rhythm prevails throughout this poem, with the cæsura after the third beat, except in l. 1 where it follows the fourth beat. The poem was perhaps organised originally into strs. of six lines each, but nothing certain can be gathered from the fragment before us.

The poetic form of chs. 2 and 3 remains to be considered. Greve (1793) was one of the first to treat the prophecy as poetry. Eich. (1816) arranged it in strs.. Poetical versions were offered also by Justi (1820), New. (1836), A. G. Hoelemannus (1842), Um. (1844), Bretschneider (1861) and Ew. (1867). But none of these had any inkling of the nature of Heb. metre. In recent times, Bu. has pointed out the existence of elegiac rhythm in chs. 2 and 3.* Rub. contributed a study of the oracle in $1^{12.\,14}$ $2^{2.\,4-14}$,† concerning the poetic form of which he said, "the whole prophecy is written in lines or *στίχοι*, every *στίχος* consisting of two or three *κῶλα*." Accordingly he found twenty *στίχοι*, of which fourteen were composed of two *κῶλα* each, five of three *κῶλα* each, and one of only one *κῶλον*. But the unevenness of the *κῶλα*, which range from three beats to six in length, robs this arrangement of any real value. In 1901, Siev. arranged 2^{1-5} in pentameters, following Bu.'s hint. Hap. (1902) was the first in recent times to arrange the whole book as poetry. His str. arrangement in part coincides with that presented in this commentary; *e. g.* the number of strs. in chs. 2 and 3 is the same in both arrangements and the first and second strs. of ch. 3 include the same materials in both. But Hap.'s reconstruction is subject to serious criticism at several points; *e. g.* 2^{9c} can hardly be made to yield two lines, nor 2^{10} four; nor can ולא ישמע עוד קול מלאכך (2^{14e}) be divided into two lines; nor is it easy to justify the presence of dimeter (3^{9}) and tetrameter (3^{10}) lines in the same str. in immediate juxtaposition (so also in 3^{13}). Marti (1904) finds one seven-line str. in elegiac rhythm in $1^{12.\,13.\,15}$ 2^{2} and organises $1^{11.\,14}$ $2^{1.\,3}$–3^{19} into a series of four-line strs., which as a rule exhibit the same elegiac movement. But this adherence to the four-line str. is possible only at the cost of disregarding logical continuity. The study by Hpt. (1907) is valuable not for its poetic analysis and arrangement which are arbitrary in the extreme (*v.* p. 270), but for the many lexicographical and grammatical hints it contains. Stk. (1908) attempts no str. analysis, but prints his text in metrical lines and indicates their metrical character. In this task, he is under no compulsion to produce lines conforming to a uniform metrical standard; but, on the contrary, in 3^{1-19}, for example, permits the appearance of heptameter, dimeter, trimeter, hexameter, tetrameter and octameter lines. This is to disregard all known laws of poetic form and introduce chaos. Du. (1910) recognises the elegiac metre throughout chs. 2 and 3 and, like Marti, applies the standard of the four-line str. consistently throughout the prophecy. He, however, secures four four-line strs. from 2^{4-7} where Marti finds only three, two from 2^{14} to Marti's one, and three from $3^{9.\ 10}$ to Marti's two. His arrangement also involves transposing 3^{19a} to follow 3^{15a}.

---

* First in *ZAW.* II (1882), 35; also in *EB.* 3262 and *Gesch.* p. 90.

† *PSBA.* XX (1898), 173–85.

In the reconstruction of the poetical form of 1^{11}–3^{19} presented in this commentary, the text is divided into three sections, viz. (1) $1^{12.\ 13.\ 15}\ 2^{2}$, (2) $1^{11.\ 14}\ 2^{1.\ 3-13}$, (3) 3^{1-19}. The first is composed of a single eight-line str. in almost perfect elegiac rhythm. The second comprises five strs., the first four having six lines each and the fifth one only three. Here elegiac rhythm reveals itself in $1^{11}\ 2^{2.\ 7.\ 8.\ 9.\ 12.\ 13}$; the variants from this are tetrameter and hexameter lines. In the third section, six strs. are contained, having 8.6.6.6.8.4 lines each, though the final str. may be a later accretion (*v.* p. 269). Elegiac rhythm recurs here in $3^{4b.\ 5.\ 6.\ 8a.\ 11.\ 12.\ 14.\ 15.\ 18.\ 19}$; the remaining lines are chiefly tetrameters and hexameters as in ch. 2. To create elegiac rhythm consistently throughout chs. 2 and 3 involves a treatment of the text which does despite to all sound canons of textual criticism.

Though the rhythm and metre of Nahum are not so smooth and regular as is the case with some Heb. prophets, yet in some respects the poetry of Nahum is unsurpassed in the OT.. His excellence is not in sublimity of thought, depth of feeling, purity of motive, or insight into truth and life. It is rather in his descriptive powers. He has an unexcelled capacity to bring a situation vividly before the mind's eye. His constructive imagination lays hold of the central elements of a scene and with realistic imagery and picturesque phraseology recreates it for his readers. Accurate and detailed observation assists in giving his pictures verisimilitude. Lowth rightly said,* "Ex omnibus minoribus prophetis nemo videtur aequare sublimitatem, ardorem et audaces spiritus Nahumi. . . . Apparatus ad excidium Ninivae ejusque excidii descriptio et amplificatio ardentissimis coloribus exprimitur et admirabilem habet evidentiam et pondus." Through the whole scene there moves a mighty passion and a great joy which lift the narrative out of the commonplace into the majestic and make of it great literature.

§ 2. THE TIMES OF NAHUM.

The upper limit for the period of Nahum's activity is established by 3^8. The fall of Thebes is there referred to as already past. But Thebes suffered more than once at the hands of Assyria. In 670 B.C., Esarhaddon had conquered the whole of lower Egypt, including Memphis, and had organised it into Assyrian dependencies. The list of the Egyptian princes who swore allegiance to him at this time includes the name of the Prince of Thebes; but Thebes was not then attacked by Esarhaddon. Again, about 667 B.C., Ashurbanipal forced Taharka to flee from Thebes and take up an intrenched position farther south; but it is doubtful whether Thebes fell into the hands of Assyria at that time.† Finally, in 661 B.C., Ashurbanipal captured Thebes and carried off an enormous booty to Nineveh. This event was the beginning of the end for the greatest city of Egypt and the ancient world. There can be little doubt but that Nahum's reference was to this occasion. So far as we now know, there was no other attack upon Thebes prior to the fall of Nineveh, which accords with the description of 3^8. It is true that by 652 B.C., Piankhi I had regained Thebes; but she never recovered her former greatness and the tradition of her impregnability had been irremediably shattered.

The lower limit for the period of Nahum's prophetic work is fixed by the date of the fall of Nineveh, to which the prophet looks forward with exulting confidence. That we are not dealing with a *vaticinium post eventum* is clear: the hope of the prophet is too genuine and fresh; the details of the siege and conquest are too minute and would be somewhat superfluous, to say the least; and the total lack of any shadow cast by the knowledge, or even suspicion, that Babylon was a far more severe taskmaster than Nineveh had ever been would be inexplicable. The date of Nineveh's fall is determined by the statement of Nabonidus that he restored the temple of Sin at Harran fifty-four years after its destruction.[*] This destruction of Harran was at the same time as that of Nineveh, or at most not more than a year earlier. The restoration of the temple of Sin occurred in the third year of Nabonidus,[†] *i. e.* 553 B.C.. Hence the fall of Harran was about 607 and that of Nineveh about 607 or 606 B.C..

---

* *De sacra poesi Hebraeorum*² (1770), II, 434.

† *V.* Breasted, *History of Egypt* (1905), 557.

The specific portion of the period between 661 B.C. and 606 B.C. in which Nahum prophesied is more difficult to determine. On the one hand, it is urged that the memory of the fall of Thebes is so vivid that no long time can have elapsed since that event. On the other hand, it is evident that the fall of Nineveh is thought of as imminent and that the invasion of Assyria has already begun (3^{13}). Hence, some seeking to combine both of these elements in the picture would place Nahum in connection with the revolt of Babylon under Shamash-shum-ukin (*v.* p. 160).[‡] But that revolt spread among and included a great many peoples, while the prophecy of Nahum seems to picture the fall of the city as due to the work of one great foe (2^{4}). Furthermore, there is no suggestion of a schism in the realm of Assyria in Nahum's description; the attack is rather from an outside foe. Nor, indeed, was the situation of Nineveh at any time during the revolt so precarious as to warrant such a confident expectation of her destruction as Nahum entertains. Babylon in that revolt was not so intent upon destroying Nineveh and Assyria as upon gaining her own independence from or even domination over Assyria. Then, too, if Nahum had had this revolt in mind, he would hardly have anticipated the destruction of Nineveh so vividly. He would have been much more likely to have conceived of Nineveh as becoming the capital of the new Babylonian power and his threats of destruction would have been confined to the dynasty reigning in Nineveh.

---

[*] Stele of Nabonidus, col. X.

[†] Cylinder of Nabonidus from Abu-habba, col. I, l. 28.

[‡] So *e. g.* Hi.; Wkl.$^{\text{Ult.}}$, 124 *f.*; Kö. *Einl.*; Kl. *SK.* 1910, pp. 501 *ff.*.

Another point of connection for the prophecy is found by some in the Scythian invasion of western Asia.* But it is by no means clear that those barbarians ever troubled Nineveh directly. Indeed, they seem to have been her salvation from the Medes in 625 B.C. (*v.* p. 163). Nor does Nahum's description of the attack upon Nineveh accord well with what is known of Scythian methods of warfare. The latter were scarcely adapted to the capture of mighty strongholds by direct assault. The Scythians hardly possessed the machinery requisite for such an undertaking.

The first attack upon Nineveh by Cyaxares (525 B.C.) is favoured by several writers as furnishing the occasion for the hopes of Nahum;† while the second attack, resulting in the destruction of the city, is preferred by the majority. The choice lies between these two. To both alike objection is made on the ground that the memory of the fall of Thebes would hardly have remained so long as vivid as is presupposed by the question in 3^8. To this it may be replied that the fall of Thebes made a profound impression in Judah, since it dealt a mortal blow to the hope for deliverance through Egypt so long encouraged by the Egyptian party in Jerusalem. Then, too, the lapse of time made it all the easier for Nahum to ignore as he did the agency of Assyria in the downfall of Thebes. Examples of even longer memory are furnished by Zc. 14^5 Nu. 13^{22}. Hence, it seems hardly necessary to suppose, with We., that Nahum referred to some destruction of Thebes in the latter part of the seventh century of which no other record has been discovered. With the elimination of ch. 1 as a later preface to the prophecy, there disappears the objection to a date near the final fall of Nineveh that arises from the fact that Nineveh's oppressive dominance over Judah is presupposed by 1^{13}. The statements of 2^{10} 3^1 apply as well to the city of 626–608 B.C. as to that of any earlier period. Nineveh did not change her character as her power diminished. The sufferings of Judah at the hands of Nineveh had lasted too long and been too humiliating and agonising to be forgotten the moment the hand of the oppressor was lifted. To a Semitic people, tenacious of revenge, the downfall of an ancient tyrant would be an occasion for joyous celebration long after release from the tyranny had been realised.

---

* So *e.g.* Jrm..

† So *e. g.* Kue. *Onderzoek* (1889); Wildeboer, *Letterkunde des Ouden Verbonds*^{3} (1903); van H..

There is little to choose between the first and the second siege of Cyaxares. The actual occurrence of the first has indeed been called in question;* but without sufficient reason. It is true the only testimony to its actuality is that of Hdt.. But on the other hand, the only testimony cited against it is the statement of Abydenus, quoted by Eusebius; viz. "Saracus certior factus quod exercitus locustarum instar mari exiens impetum faceret, Busalossorum ducem confestim Babelonem misit." This is interpreted by We. as applying to an attack of the Scythians from the Black Sea upon Babylon at the very time when Nineveh, according to Hdt., was undergoing siege at the hands of the Medes, thus being hindered by her own necessities from sending aid to any other city. However, waiving the question as to the relative values of Hdt. and Abydenus as historians, it is far from certain that the citation from the latter has anything to do with the time about 625 B.C.. Saracus, generally identified with Sin-shar-ishkun, was not the immediate successor of Ashurbanipal upon the throne of Assyria, as would be the case if he had been king in 625 B.C.. Babylon was independent of Nineveh and under its own king from 626 on; hence the interest of the king of Assyria in its defence is strange. Moreover, why should a king of Assyria send his army to defend Babylon from a foe advancing from the north, thus leaving his own capital inviting attack from the same foe by the weakness of its defence? The datum concerning Saracus must be accounted for in some more satisfactory way.

The certain fact is that at the time of Nahum's utterance, the prestige of Nineveh was wholly gone. She was threatened with immediate destruction. The enemy was already in the land and her downfall seemed certain. This interpretation might have been placed by Nahum upon the situation as it was either in 625 B.C. or in 608–606 B.C.. But the degree of animosity toward Nineveh accords better, perhaps, with the post-Deuteronomic date, 608–606 B.C., than with the pre-Deuteronomic period.* The expectation of Nahum was certainly not fulfilled till about 606 B.C. and, if the prophet is to be credited with an adequate knowledge of the movements of his day, we shall be forced to interpret his utterance as applying to the final siege. On the whole, therefore, it is better to place him there than at the earlier date, until we have more definite information as to the course of events in Assyria during her last days and as to the exactness of the information in possession of the Hebrews regarding the political movements of the time. In any case, the significance of the prophecy will remain the same, whichever of the two dates be chosen.

---

* *E. g.* by We.

The assignment of Nahum to the Maccabaean age, as proposed by Hap. and Hpt., is put practically out of the question by the testimony of BS. 48^{20-25} $49^{6.\ 8.\ 10}$ as to the history of the Canon. The mention there of "the twelve prophets" shows that at that time the Book of the Twelve was already known and held in high esteem. It is, of course, not to be denied that the Book of the Twelve underwent more or less modification after that date, viz. *c.* 180 B.C.. But it is scarcely to be conceived that a new name was added to the twelve already known and that one of the latter was dropped. Yet this is involved in the proposition to make Nahum a product of the Maccabaean period.† Nor are the positive arguments brought forward by Hap. at all convincing. The differences between Nahum and the rest of the pre-exilic prophets included in the Canon are certainly striking; but it does not follow that Nahum is necessarily postexilic or Maccabaean. The character of the differences is not such as to make them inconsistent with pre-exilic origin (*v.* p. 281). Nor is 3^8 satisfactorily explained by the failure of Antiochus Epiphanes to take Alexandria. That failure was not due to the strength of Alexandria, as would be required by 3^8, but to the intervention of the power of Rome. Nor is 3^4 explicable only on the basis of the religious intolerance and propagandism of Antiochus (*v.* note *ad loc.*).

---

* *V.* Bertholet, *Die Stellung der Israeliten zu den Fremden* (1905), 105 *f*..

† *Cf.* Francis Brown on *The Decline of Prophecy*, in *Essays in Modern Theology and Related Subjects Gathered and Published as a Testimonial to Chas. A. Briggs* (1911), p. 67.

If Nahum lived and prophesied in the days immediately preceding the downfall of Nineveh, his lot was cast in desperate times. The good King Josiah had but recently fallen in battle at Megiddo. His successor Jehoahaz had been taken prisoner to Egypt, after a reign of only three months, and Jehoiakim had been imposed upon Judah as a vassal of Pharaoh Necho. A heavy annual tribute was laid upon Judah and it was Jehoiakim's ungracious task to collect and transmit it to Egypt. The practical freedom that had been enjoyed for some time under Josiah had given place to a galling servitude. The news of the approaching end of a former taskmaster was a ray of light amid Egyptian darkness.

§ 3. THE MAN AND THE MESSAGE.

The Man.

Beyond the slight information furnished by the book itself, nothing is at hand from which to reconstruct the personality and the environment of Nahum. He must remain little more to us than a voice. For details regarding his name and residence, *v.* pp. 285 *ff.*. Some interpreters have sought to make him a resident of Assyria and an eye-witness of the scenes he describes. But his knowledge of Assyrian words, places and customs is only such as was easily within the reach of any intelligent Hebrew of his times. Assyrian matters had been of absorbing interest to the politicians of Judah for more than a century. Assyrian armies were no uncommon sight in Syria, however unwelcome they may have been. Travel and commerce between Jerusalem and Nineveh were constant and continuous. The main facts concerning the structure and defences of Nineveh were doubtless known to the leading men of Judah. Nor does the vividness of Nahum's picture of the movements against Nineveh prove anything in favour of his residence in Assyria. The scenes of ch. 1 are just as vivid as anything in the book, yet the writer there was evidently drawing upon his imagination. The whole spirit and background of the prophecy are Hebrew and the burden of proof rests upon him who would seek to account for its origin on foreign soil.

Nahum was an enthusiastic, optimistic patriot. The oppression and humiliation endured by his people for generations had long rankled in his soul. He is a fair representative of the state of mind of the average man of his times, whose faith in Yahweh's goodness and power had been severely tried by the continuous spectacle of the sufferings of Israel. The prospect of the speedy overthrow of the ancient tyrant who had done the most to render life intolerable for the people of Yahweh brought with it a great revulsion of feeling to men like Nahum. Sorrow and discouragement approximating despair gave way to exuberant joy and returning hope. Assyria was to receive the due reward of all her evil deeds; Yahweh was to vindicate himself by his righteous acts; and for Israel the dawn of a new day was discernible upon the horizon.

The Message.

The prophecy of Nahum is simple and unique. It concerns itself with only one theme—Nineveh is on the brink of destruction; there is no possibility of escape for her. In ecstatic contemplation of this 'consummation devoutly to be wished for,' the prophet is wholly absorbed. He can, he will see nothing else.

This it is that sets him apart from all preceding prophecy. His predecessors have been interested primarily, and almost exclusively, in the sin of Israel. Their task had been that of calling their countrymen to repentance and of pointing out to them a much more excellent way to assure themselves of the favour of God than that along which they had been travelling. The future of Israel was precious indeed in the sight of God; but only a radical readjustment of life in the present could make that future anything but disastrous. Of all this, Nahum has not a word. In place of it, there appears a certain fiery form of indignation against Judah's ancient foe, which exhibits a degree of animosity for which the great ethical prophets furnish no parallel. The pent-up feelings of generations of suffering patriots here burst forth into flame. The whole prophecy is a pæan of triumph over a prostrate foe and breathes out the spirit of exultant revenge.

The contrast between the message of Nahum and that of Jeremiah, his contemporary, is striking. To the prophet of larger vision and deeper insight, the event which filled Nahum's entire range of vision was of relatively slight importance. The passing of the Assyrian dominion is not even mentioned by Jeremiah, nor does the name of Nineveh once appear in his utterances. The two men belonged to different religious and political parties. If Nahum was not in active opposition to Jeremiah, he was at least indifferent to his efforts. Instead of grieving over the sin of Judah and striving with might and main to warn her of the error of her ways that she herself might turn and live, Nahum was apparently content to lead her in a jubilant celebration of the approaching death of Assyria. Jeremiah was too overwhelmed by sorrow and alarm for his own people to obtain any solace from the misfortune of another, which could bring no relief to the desperate situation of Judah.

In Nahum, a representative of the old, narrow and shallow prophetism finds its place in the Canon of Scripture. His point of view is essentially one with that of such men as Hananiah (Je. 28), the four hundred prophets in opposition to Micaiah ben Imlah (1 K. 22), and the so-called "false prophets" in general. For such prophets, the relation between Yahweh and his nation Israel was indissoluble. Yahweh might become angered at his people and give them over temporarily into the power of the foe. But he could no more wholly abandon them than a mother could desert her child. The obligation upon Israel was to be loyal to Yahweh as he was loyal to her; to eschew all foreign cults; to perform the cultus of Yahweh with zealous adherence to all of its requirements; and to conform to the traditional customs and ethics of the community. The possibility that new occasions might teach new duties, that the advancing civilisation with its more complex life might render the old usages and laws inadequate, and that Yahweh might care more for full justice and overflowing mercy than for the blood of bulls and goats had not been realised by them. The teaching that for a lack of fundamental, ethical qualities Yahweh was intending to bring destruction upon his nation was branded by them as treason both to Israel and to Yahweh. Patriotism and religion combined in requiring the belief that Yahweh was able and willing to deliver his people out of every danger. Never could he suffer the adherents of other gods to triumph permanently over his own people. Never could the land of Judah and the temple of Yahweh be desecrated by being abandoned to the possession of the heathen. Nor could insult and injury to Yahweh and his people be allowed by him to go unavenged. To men of such a way of thinking, the prospect of the downfall of Nineveh would bring a joy without alloy. The prophecy of Nahum is a faithful transcript of the thoughts and feelings of a prophet with such a point of view. The overthrow of Nineveh not only brought to Nahum and those of like mind satisfaction of the natural, human desire for vengeance, but it also enabled them to justify the ways of God to men. Such objective demonstration of the justice of Yahweh was essential to the validity of their theology. By such vindication of Yahweh and his people, faith in Yahweh was made possible for them. Hence, the joy of Nahum is not only and merely exultation over a fallen foe, it is also the glad cry of an assured faith in the God of the fathers.

§ 4. LITERATURE ON THE BOOK OF NAHUM.

Commentaries.

In addition to the commentaries on the Minor Prophets as a whole by Ewald (1867), Kleinert (1868), Hitzig-Steiner (1881), von Orelli (1888; 3d ed. 1908), Wellhausen (1892; 3d ed. 1898), Nowack (1897; 2d ed. 1903), G. A. Smith (1898), Marti (1903) and van Hoonacker (1908), special mention must be made of Strauss (1853), Davidson (1896), Kolmodin (1898), Happel (1902), Driver (1906), Haupt (1907), Kautzsch (1909) and Kent (1910).

Introduction.

All the 'Introductions' to the OT. as a whole contain sections summarising the main facts about Nahum as do also the introductions to most of the aforesaid commentaries. In addition to these, the following are worthy of special mention:—Billerbeck und Jeremias, *Der Untergang Nineveh's und die Weissagungsschrift des Nahum von Elkosch*, *BAS*. III (1898), 87–188. P. Kleinert, *Nahum und der Fall Nineves*, *SK*. LXXXIII (1910), 501–533. Thomas Friedrich, *Nineve's Ende und die Ausgänge des Assyrischen Reiches*, in *Festgaben zu Ehren Max Büdinger's* (1898), 13–52. Budde, art. *Nahum*, *EB*. III (1902). A. R. S. Kennedy, art. *Nahum*, *DB*. III (1900). Volck, art. *Nahum*, *PRE.*^{3} XIII (1903). W. Staerk, *Das Assyrische Weltreich im Urteil der Propheten* (1908), 174–181.

Special studies on ch. 1 and on the poetic form of the book are cited in § 1 (pp. 270 *ff*.).

Miscellaneous.

M. Adler, *A Specimen of a Commentary and Collated Text of the Targum to the Prophet Nahum*, *JQR*. VII (1895), 630–657. Reinke, *Zur Kritik der älteren Versionen des Propheten Nahum* (1867). A. W. Greenup, *The Yalkut of Rabbi Machir Bar Abba Mari on Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum and Habakkuk* [Edited for the first time from the unique ms. (Harley 5704) in the British Museum] (1910). Fr. Buhl, *Einige textkritische Bemerkungen zu den Kleinen Propheten*, *ZAW*. V (1885), 79–84. E. Mahler, *Untersuchung einer in Buche Nahum auf den Untergang Ninives bezogenen Finsterniss* (1886). B. Duhm, *Anmerkungen zu den Zwölf Propheten*, V, *Buch Nahum*, *ZAW*. XXXI (1911), 100–107.

A COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF NAHUM.

§ 1. THE SUPERSCRIPTIONS (1^{1}).

These inform us as to the name of the author, his clan, the nature of his book, and the subject of his preaching. In common with the superscriptions to Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Habakkuk and Malachi among the prophetic books, it refrains from any statement regarding the time of this prophet's activity. Nahum is the only book in the OT. carrying two superscriptions at its head and is also the only prophecy entitling itself a 'book.'

1. *An oracle on Nineveh*] Nahum is pre-eminently a book of one idea, viz. the doom of Nineveh. This title thus exactly fits the contents of the book. This type of superscription is common in Isaiah, viz. 13^{1} 15^{1} 17^{1} 19^{1} $21^{1.11}$ 22^{1} 23^{1} 30^{6}. On the fall of Nineveh, *v.* pp. 163 *f.*.—*The book of the vision of Nahum the Elkoshite*] The use of the word 'book' here carries no such special significance as some older commentators imagined; *viz.* that it shows that the prophecy of Nahum was never spoken but was originally prepared in written form.* The word 'vision' expressly characterises the following message as a revelation. The prophecies of Isaiah (1^{1}) and Obadiah (v. ^{1}) are also so designated. The name Nahum occurs only here in the OT.. Everything alleged regarding Nahum, aside from the statement of the superscription, is of late origin and of little value. Other names from the same root and so of similar meaning are Nehemiah, Nehum (Ne. 7^{7}; but *cf.* Ezr. 2^{2}=Rehum), Nahamani (Ne. 7^{7}), Menahem and Tanhumeth (Je. 40^{8}). The name seems to be an appellation meaning 'comforting' or 'comforter.' Its appropriateness to the author of this prophecy, which brings the promise of such great comfort to Judah, raises the suspicion that the name is not a birth name but one be-

---

* So Gebhardt, Tarnovius, Pu., Ke..

stowed upon this prophet by a later editor because of the character of his message. The term 'Elkoshite' seems to be a gentilic adjective derived from a place-name. But no thoroughly reliable information is available as to the location of Elkosh (*v. i.*).

The essential accuracy of the superscriptions is generally acknowledged. The first, stating the contents of the book, accords perfectly with the bulk of the subject-matter; while the second, being beyond the possibility of a satisfactory test, and being in no way derivable from the text of the book itself, must be given the benefit of every doubt and be held to rest upon sound tradition. Owing to the twofold character of the heading, however, suspicion has been cast upon its genuineness. Grimm (1791) was the first to see here the work of a later hand. He has had many followers, who have declared the superscription in whole or in part to be of late origin; so Eich. (*Einl.* III, 371), Ew., Hd., Or., Dav., Now., Arn., Hap., Bu. (*EB.*), Marti, Kau., Du., Kent. It is probable that the two portions of the legend come from different hands, as Ew., Or., Bu., *et al.* suggest; but it is unnecessary to regard each as having belonged originally to its own special portion of the book as Hpt. *et al.* maintain. If any part of the heading be from Nahum himself, it is probably only the last three words, "Vision of Nahum the Elkoshite." The order of the parts would have been exactly the reverse had they both been due to the prophet and the word "book" would surely not have appeared. In view of the extent of the editorial labour upon the beginning of this book, it is more likely that the older portion of the heading came from an editor than that it came from the prophet himself. The addition of superscriptions, as a matter of fact, seems to have been a favourite form of editorial exercise. The information furnished by this editor, however, probably goes back to a relatively early date, for no source whence it might have been obtained is now known.

1. מַשָּׂא] 𝔊 λῆμμα. Aq. ἆρμα. 𝔖 *meḥûthā* = 'scourge' or 'affliction,' the only place where 𝔖 so renders the word (Seb.). מ׳ is here followed by an objective gen.. The rendering 'burden' was favoured by early interpreters and explained by the fact that disaster was the prevailing theme of prophecy, hence the term 'burden' came to be applied to all prophecies. But 'oracle' or 'utterance' (*cf.* נשא קול) is a better rendering in superscriptions, where 'burden' is sometimes wholly inappropriate, *e. g.* Zc. 12^{1}.—נחום] Of the same measure as שַׁכּוּל 'bereaved,' רַחוּם 'compassionate,' אַלּוּף 'tame' or 'chief,' חַנּוּן 'merciful,' עַמּוּד 'pillar'; and with transitive force; *cf.* Barth, *NB.* §§ 37, 132. An abstract substantive 'comfort' is less suitable as a name and less in accord with the significance of other words of the formation; *contra* BDB.. The name occurs also in Lk. 3^{25} 2 Esd. 1^{40}, Jos. *Ant.* IX, xi, 3, the Mishnah (Baba Bathra V 2, Shabb. II 1, Nazir V 4, Peah II 6), on Jewish ossuaries

(Clermont-Ganneau, *Revue Archéol.* Ser. III, vol. I, No. 41) and in Phœnician (*CIS.* I, No. 123; Ges., *Mon. Phœn.* Nos. 3, 7; Boeckh, *Corp. Ins. Græc.* II, 25, 26). It is likely that the name is a shortened form of נחמיהו or נחמאל (Kennedy, *DB.* III, 473). Abar. explained it as connected with נח (Gn. 5^{29}); *cf.* Sayce, *Exp.T.* XV, 514, who treats ם as due to mimmation; but such usage is not well attested in Heb..—האלקשי] 𝔗 בבית קושי. 𝔊^{B} τοῦ Ἐλκεσαίου. 𝔊^{ℵ*} Ἐλκαισέου. 𝔊$^{ℵ\ c.\ b}$ Ἐλκεσεου. Eus. *Onom.* Ἐλκεσέ. Hesychius (*vita proph.*) Ἐλκεσεῖν. 𝔙 *Elcesaei.* Four sites lay claim to the honour of having been the home of Nahum. The first claimant is Al-Ḳûsh, a village about 25 miles N. of Mosul, where the natives with one consent regard a certain plaster box as the tomb of Nahum (Layard, *Nineveh and Its Remains* [1849], I, 233). But Assemani (*Biblioth. Orient.* [1719 *ff.*], I. 525, III, 352) declares that the tradition dates no further back than the 16th century A.D.; the Ar. form of the name seems to reflect the Ar. period; the name of the place itself is first attested in the 8th century A.D. (*cf.* Nö. *ZDMG.* XXXI, 165); Benjamin of Tudela in 1165 A.D. was shown another tomb of Nahum at 'Ain Japhata, S. of Babylon; and the tradition is worth no more than similar traditions as to the graves of Jonah, Obadiah, and Jepthah of Gilead. The acceptance of this site usually carries with it the conclusion that Nahum was one of the exiles from Samaria or a descendant of them, who had been settled N. of Nineveh. But the whole tone of the prophecy points to a scion of Judah as its author. This last objection also holds against the next two applicants. Jerome in his commentary on Nahum says, "Quum Elcese usque hodie in Galilea viculus sit, parvus quidem et vix ruinis veterum aedificiorum indicans vestigia, sed tamen notus Judaeis et mihi quoque a circumducente monstratus." This is generally supposed to have been the modern El Kauze, N.E. of Ramieh and about seven miles W. of Tibnin. But there is no indication of Nahum's Galilaean origin; on the contrary, his utter silence as to any hope for the northern kingdom and its exiles seems fatal to such a theory. His reference to the invasion of Sennacherib in 1^{11} likewise points to his primary interest in Judah and Jerusalem. Hi. identified Elkosh with Capernaum (𝔊 Καφαρναούμ; 𝔖 *Kaphar Nahum* = 'village of Nahum'); but it is by no means certain that נחום formed the latter part of this name, for Jos. writes Κεφαρνώμη and Jerome on Mt. 11^{24}, נעום (𝔖 of Mt. 4^{13} 11^{23} = נחום; so also Talmud) and the evidence is insufficient to outweigh the improbability of a Galilaean residence for Nahum. The least difficult tradition locates Elkosh in S. Judah. The *de vitis prophetarum*, wrongly ascribed to Epiphanius (a native of Judah who was Bishop of Salamis in Cyprus in 367 A.D.), in some mss. says "He (Nahum) came from Elkesei beyond Jordan toward Begabar of the tribe of Simeon." But the tribe of Simeon was located in S.W. Judah and "beyond Jordan" is therefore unintelligible in this connection. The difficulty is solved by two recensions of *vitae proph.* published by Tischendorf in 1855 and based upon older Greek mss., in one of which the passage runs, "Nahum, son of Elkesaios, was of Jesbe of the tribe of Simeon"; and the other reads, "Nahum was from Elkese beyond Isbegabarin of the tribe of Simeon." The phrase "beyond Jordan" is thus shown to be a gloss. This is also supported by the citations from the *Vitae* incorporated in the Syriac translation of the OT. by Paul of Tella (617 A.D.), where the reading is "Nahum was of Elkosh, beyond Beth-Gabre, of the tribe of Simeon" (*v.* Nestle, *ZDPV.* I, 122 *f.*= *Pal. Explor. Fund's Quarterly Statement* for 1879, p. 136; *Idem, Marginalien und Materialien* [1893], 43 *f.*). Beth-Gabre is the modern Beit-jibrîn, *i. e.* the ancient Eleutheropolis. About six miles E. of Beit-jibrîn, at the upper end of the Wady es-Sur, there is an old well named Bir el-Ḳaus, which might be a survival of Elkosh. This is an altogether suitable region for the prophet's home and may be tentatively adopted in lieu of a better-accredited claimant. This would make Nahum come from the same district as his predecessor Micah. An ingenious hypothesis is proposed by Hap., viz. that the following acrostic originally fell into two sections, the first including vv. $^{2-10}$. The opening word of this section was אל, the closing one was קש. An editor attached as a descriptive heading to this section the words, "vision of Nahum from אל to קש." By later misunderstanding, the present text arose. Such a method of designating a portion of a text is not elsewhere used in the OT. and it is difficult to account for the loss of the connecting prepositions.

§ 2. THE AVENGING WRATH OF YAHWEH (1$^{2-10}$).

A fragment of an acrostic poem, the fifteen lines of which begin with the successive letters of the Heb. alphabet in their natural order. Owing to the formal character of the poem, there is no clearly marked logical progress, nor organisation into strs.. The general thought concerns itself with the terrors of Yahweh's anger against his foes. In an ever-changing series of bold and striking metaphors, the poet seeks to create a vivid impression of this divine wrath and thus to quicken the faith and hope of those who have trusted in and obeyed Yahweh.

(א) A jealous and avenging God is Yahweh, and filled with wrath.
(ב) In storm and tempest is his way, and clouds are the dust of his feet.
(ג) He rebukes the sea and dries it up, and all the streams he makes dry.
(ד) Bashan and Carmel wither, and the bud of Lebanon languishes.

(ה) The mountains quake at him, and the hills melt.
(ו) And the earth is laid waste before him, the world with all its inhabitants.
(ז) His anger—who can stand fast before it? Who can stand in the heat of his wrath?
(ח) His fury is poured out like fire, and the rocks are burst asunder because of him.
(ט) Yahweh is good to those waiting for him, a stronghold in the day of distress.
(י) Yahweh knows those that seek refuge in him, and with an overflowing flood. . . .
(כ) A full end will he make of his adversaries, and his enemies he will pursue into darkness.
(ל) He will not take vengeance twice upon his foes, for unto complete destruction he is about to work.
(מ) What do you devise against Yahweh?
(נ) Yahweh takes vengeance on his adversaries and lays up wrath for his foes.
(ס) Thorns cut down and dried out—they will be consumed like dry stubble.

2. *A jealous and avenging God is Yahweh, and full of wrath*] "The truth that no historical crime can ever as a crime be forgotten by Yahweh through the flight of time, but must in all cases, either sooner or later, be punished by the living and all-observing God, is brought forward briefly and with dignified repose at the very beginning."* For the attribute of jealousy as applied to Yahweh, *cf.* Jos. 24^{19} Ex. 20^{5} 34^{14} Dt. 4^{24} 6^{15}. Yahweh is here presented as the originator and guardian of the law of righteousness, who regards every violation of that law as an offence against himself which must be fitly punished. The particular form of offence here resented is evidently the wrongs done to Israel by the great powers. The thought of Yahweh's vengeance upon his foes was a favourite one from the time of Jeremiah on to the end; *e. g.* Je. 11^{20} 51^{11} Ez. $25^{14.\ 17}$ Dt. 32^{35} Is. 61^{2} 63^{4} Ps. 94^{1}; *cf.* Rom. 12^{19}.—In 𝔐 there appear at this point two lines (vv. $^{2b.\ 3a}$) which are shown not to have been originally placed here by the fact that they break the continuity of the acrostic. The first of these lines in all probability originally followed v. ^{9}, where it belongs alphabetically. Its presence here may be accounted for as due to the fact that it expresses essentially the same thought as line 1 and begins with the word 'vengeful' or 'avenging' that occurs also there. Some editor, not recognising the alphabetic structure, placed the line where it seemed to belong logically. The second added line (v. ^{3a}) reads,

---

* Ew..

Yahweh is slow to anger and great in mercy, but Yahweh will by no means leave unpunished] This seems to be a gloss* intended to modify the absolute statement of line 1 by presenting another and complementary phase of the divine character. Not only does it depart from the alphabetic order, but it is an abnormally long line, unless with Bick. we drop the last clause as a later appendix to the line, in which case the line becomes too short. For the thought and phraseology of this line, *cf.* Nu. $14^{17 \text{ f.}}$ Ex. $34^{6 \text{ f.}}$ Jo. 2^{13}. After the strong statement of Yahweh's wrath in v. ^{2a}, the glossator felt the need of a reference to the patience and mercy of God, but was careful to add that even so, Yahweh was not one to let the wicked go scot-free. 𝔐 has "great in strength," an idiom nowhere else occurring, which is here changed to "great in mercy" as in Ps. 145^{8}; *cf.* also Ex. 34^{6} Nu. 14^{18} Ne. 9^{17} Ps. 103^{8} Jo. 2^{13} Jon. 4^{2}. If 𝔐 be original, the strength spoken of must be moral strength, and the thought probably is that Yahweh's self-control is too great to permit him to act upon the impulse of sudden outbursts of wrath. —**3b.** *In storm and tempest is his way and clouds are the dust of his feet*] The acrostic structure is resumed here. The theophanies of the OT. are usually set to the accompaniment of convulsions of nature, particularly so when the deity is represented as manifesting himself in wrath; *cf.* Mi. $1^{3 \text{ f.}}$ Ju. $5^{4 \text{ f.}}$ Jb. 38^{1} 40^{6} Zc. 9^{14} Hb. 3^{3-6} Is. $50^{2 \text{ f.}}$. The storm clouds are by a beautiful figure represented as the fine dust stirred up by the feet of Yahweh as he passes along in his wrath. There is nothing gained, but much lost, by the emendation "clouds and dust are at his feet" (*v. i.*). Dav. well says, "the splendid words . . . like the others 'the earth is his footstool' need to be conceived, not explained."—**4.** *He rebukes the sea and dries it up, and all the streams he makes dry*] *Cf.* Is. 50^{2} 51^{10} Ps. 66^{6} 77^{19} 106^{9}. Yahweh is absolute lord of creation and does with it as he will. Under other conditions, Yahweh is represented as doing the exact opposite of what he does here (Is. $35^{1.6.7}$). —*Bashan withers away and Carmel, and the bud of Lebanon languishes*] Bashan was one of the most fertile of the regions east of the Jordan and seems to have been famous for its flocks (Am. 1^{2} 4^{1} Mi. 7^{14}) and trees. With it, the wooded heights of Carmel and the snow-clad summits of Lebanon are mentioned as representatives of the regions least likely to show the effects of an ordinary drought. It is forcing the language to argue from the mention of these particular regions, as Hap. does, that the poem must have come from the period of the Syrian dominion and that destruction is threatened upon regions belonging to the Syrians, the foes of Yahweh. Against another view, viz. that these three regions represent three extreme points in east, west and north and so comprise the whole land, it is sufficient to say that nowhere else is the land as a whole so indicated.—**5.** *Mountains quake before him and the hills melt*] The very pillars of the earth, as the ancients considered the mountains (Jb. $9^{5.\,6}$), tremble and dissolve before the wrath of Yahweh. For similar representations, *cf.* Mi. 1^{4} Zc. 14^{4} Ex. 19^{8} Dt. 4^{11} Ju. 5^{5} Jb. 28^{9} Ps. 114^{4} Is. $64^{1.\,3}$ Hb. 3^{10}. Earthquakes or volcanic disturbances were apparently familiar phenomena to the Hebrews and furnished the materials in large part for their descriptions of theophanies.—*And the earth is laid waste before him, the world with all those dwelling therein*] 𝔐 is rendered by RV., "and the earth is upheaved, etc."; but this is a very doubtful rendering. Having taken up particular aspects of nature thus far, the writer here includes the whole world, animate and inanimate. The Hebrews, knowing practically nothing of natural law or secondary causes, conceived of both the physical and the moral universe as governed directly and immediately by Yahweh himself. There was for them but one world and that was God's world. Hence when disorder and disobedience were rife in the moral realm, it was inevitable that the physical realm should share in the shock occasioned by the divine visitation upon sin.

---

* So Gunk., We., Now., Gray, Or., Hap., Dr., van H.. *Cf.* Marti, Hpt., Stk. and Kent who excerpt the last clause and use it to complete the ט line in v. ^{9}; while Du. begins the poem with v. ^{3} and completes the ב line with v. ^{2}.

With the seventh line, the writer takes a fresh start. Having devoted the last four lines to illustrations of the terrible wrath of Yahweh as manifested in the physical world, he now, as in line 1, again brings the wrath itself to the forefront.—**6.** *His anger—who can stand fast before it? Who can stand in the heat of his wrath?*] For text, *v. i.*. For similar formulations of the same thought, *v.* Am. 7^{2} Mal. 3^{2} Je. 10^{10}; *cf.* Ps. 24^{3}. This is a direct and personal application of the lesson taught by the preceding illustrations. No nation can stand before such a God, for he is a consuming fire (Dt. 4^{24}).—*His fury is poured out like fire*] A favourite figure to express the divine anger (Je. 7^{20} 42^{18} 44^{6} 2 Ch. 12^{7} $34^{21.\ 25}$). The destructive and purificatory effects of fire have always appealed to the religious imagination as a fit symbol of divine wrath and holiness. The Persian fire-worship is the notable illustration of this.—*And the rocks are burst asunder because of him*] *Cf.* Mi. 1^{4} Je. 4^{26} 23^{29} $51^{25.\ 26}$. Whether this effect is conceived of as due to the heat already mentioned, or to some other aspect of the divine power, is not certain; but in any case, it is the awful presence of God which produces such catastrophic results.—**7.** *Yahweh is good to those who wait for him*] Another side of the divine nature is now emphasised. The wrath of Yahweh is vented upon those who hate him; but for those who put their trust in him he has lovingkindness (Dt. $5^{9\,\mathrm{f.}}$). The whole history of Israel from the Assyrian period to the end was one long agony of waiting. The fulfilment of her hopes was constantly deferred. The history of no other people can furnish a parallel to the strength and persistence of Israel's faith and hope. The odds were apparently all against her, but she refused to let go her faith in God. One of the exhortations most frequently upon the lips of prophets and psalmists was the summons to patience and hope; *e. g.* Gn. 49^{18} Is. 8^{17} 30^{18} 64^{4} Hb. 2^{3} Zp. 3^{8} Ps. $25^{5.\ 21}$ 27^{14} $37^{3.\ 5.\ 7.\ 9.\ 34}$ 39^{7} 52^{9} $118^{8.\ 9}$ La. 3^{25}. Disappointed in one expectation, Israel did but transform it into another and continue to "expect great things from God."—*A refuge in the day of distress*] A place whither to flee from the storm; this is a common way of speaking of Yahweh; *e. g.* Je. 16^{19} Ps. 27^{1} $31^{3.\ 5}$ 37^{39} 52^{9} Is. 17^{10} 25^{4} 32^{2} Jo. 4^{16}.—*Yahweh knows those that take refuge in him*] *Cf.* Ps. 1^{6}. The 'knowledge' here spoken of is inclusive of that tender interest and watchcare which inhere in a father's love (Am. 3^{2}). When they flee to him for aid, they will not be received as strangers, but with open arms as Yahweh's children; *cf.* Ps. 2^{12} 5^{11} 46, 144^{2}.—**8.** *And with an overflowing flood . . .*] This sentence is evidently incomplete. Most interpreters make it refer to the pious followers of Yahweh and so supply either "he will deliver them" or "he will guard them" (*v. i.*). But in view of the fact that 'flood' is always used in connection with destructive activities (Ps. 32^{6} Pr. 27^{4} Jb. 38^{25} Is. 54^{8} Dn. 9^{26} 11^{22}), it is not at all improbable that the sentence refers to the foes of Yahweh and should therefore be completed after this fashion "he will destroy the wicked." Some have seen in the 'overflowing flood' a definite allusion to the invading army that was to destroy Nineveh (*cf.* Is. 8^{8});* but it is rather a general characterisation of the overwhelming destruction which Yahweh will bring upon his foes when he asserts his divine majesty. Von Orelli, by omitting a conjunction, secures the following line, "he knows those who trust in him when the flood overflows." But such a line is too short for the metre and involves the use of the phrase 'in flood' as the equivalent of a temporal clause.—*A full end will he make of his adversaries*] 𝔐 reads for the last phrase, "of her place"; this is usually supposed to refer to Nineveh. But there has been no mention of Nineveh thus far in the poem; hence the suffix "her" is without any antecedent. Modern interpreters, therefore, prefer to follow the suggestion of 𝔊 𝔗. This is the first specific mention of the foes of Yahweh, though the previous lines have, of course, been spoken with reference to them. Here, Yahweh's treatment of them is brought into immediate and striking contrast with his attitude toward the pious.—*And his enemies he will pursue into darkness*] A figure suggestive of the hopelessness and desolation that will overtake the foes of Yahweh; there will be no way of escape for them. The syntax permits equally well the rendering, "darkness will pursue his enemies,"† and the sense is almost equally good. But in the parallel clauses, Yahweh is the subject and it is more natural that the overthrow of Yahweh's foes should be referred directly to him himself, rather than to one of his agencies. The change from 'pursue' to 'thrust out' (Jb. 18^{18}) seems unnecessary (*v. i.*); *cf.* Pr. 13^{21}.—**9c.** *He will not take vengeance twice upon his adversaries*] The exigiencies of the acrostic structure require the placing of this line here rather than where it is in 𝔐. 𝔐 reads, "not twice will affliction arise." This is a less probable reading than that suggested by 𝔊 because (1) Yahweh is the subject of the action in the parallel clause, (2) no close analogy for 𝔐's phrase is known, (3) 𝔐's thought is too abstract and colourless for this context. The specific meaning of 𝔐 has been sought in two main directions. Some find a promise to Judah to the effect that Assyria shall not again afflict her as she did under Sennacherib or as she had done to Samaria.* Others take it as a threat against Nineveh to the effect that no second disaster will be needed to accomplish her overthrow.† This is essentially the same thought as that conveyed by the reading here followed, viz. no second stroke of chastisement will be necessary (*cf.* 1 S. 3^{12} 26^{8} 2 S. 20^{10}); Yahweh will punish once for all. None will dare to oppose him again. This meaning is strongly supported by the remainder of the line. —**9b.** *For unto complete destruction he is about to work*] This is an exact parallel to v. ^{9c} and fits here better than after ^{9a}.‡ It reaffirms the proposition made in ^{8b} and clinches it. 𝔐 has here "a full end he is about to make" (*cf.* Ez. 11^{13}); this yields good sense, but lacks any formal connective with the preceding half of the line. By using the first two words of v. ^{10} here, we not only secure a smoother connection, but also account satisfactorily for the two words which at the beginning of v. ^{10} are unintelligible and have baffled all interpreters. For the idiom "unto complete destruction," *cf.* Dn. 9^{27} Ez. 13^{13} 2 Ch. 12^{12}; and for the absolute use of the verb 'work' (עשׂה), *cf.* 1 K. 8$^{32.\ 39}$ Je. 14^{7} Ez. 20^{9} Ps. 22^{31} 37^{5} 52^{9} Mal. 3^{17} Dn. 9^{19}.—**9a.** *What are you devising against Yahweh?*] Not "what are you thinking of Yahweh?"§ The verb חשב in the Piʿel with אל or על always means "to plot" or "plan against" (Ho. 7^{15} Dn. 11^{24}). The writer here addresses himself directly to the foes of Yahweh and seeks by this pointed question to bring out the futility of all human devices aimed against the great God; *cf.* Ps. 33^{10}. The answer to this question, or whatever else it may have been that formed the original conclusion of this line, is now lost.—**2b.** *Yahweh takes vengeance on his adversaries and lays up wrath*

---

* So *e. g.* Sanctius, Rosenm., Hi., Hd..

† So *e. g.* 𝔊 𝔙 𝔖, Cal., Mau., Hd., Stei., New., Dav., Hap

---

* So *e. g.* Jer., Sanctius, Hd., Pu., Or..

† So *e. g.* Theodoret., Ra., Ki., Rosenm., Hi., Um., Ew. We., Hal..

‡ The order $^{9c.\ b.\ a}$ is that adopted by Bick., Gunk., Gray, Marti, Now.^{K}, Hpt., Stk., Du., Kent.

§ *Contra* Rosenm., Ew., Strauss, Ke., We., Dav., GASm., Now., Arn., Hap., Marti, Kent. "Against Yahweh" is adopted by 𝔊 𝔙 𝔖, Hi., Gray, Hal., Dr., Hpt., van H., Kau..

for his foes] The right of this line to stand here is shown by its nearness in thought to the preceding line, by its fitting into the acrostic at this point, and by the fact that it is superfluous where it stands in 𝔐.* Others treat the line as a part of the gloss on v. ^{2a}† intended to limit the absolute statement there made by the additional suggestion that Yahweh's vengeance is reserved only for his enemies. For the phrase 'lays up wrath,' *cf.* Je. $3^{5.\ 12}$ Ps. 103^{9}, where Yahweh's attitude toward his own people is declared to be just the opposite of that which he is here credited with holding toward his foes. The prohibition of this state of mind which is laid upon Israel in Lv. 19^{18} recognises the same difference between Israelites and non-Israelites; *cf.* Am. 1^{11}.—**10.** *Thorns cut down and dried out—they will be devoured like dry stubble*] As it stands in 𝔐, this verse is wholly unintelligible. Modern interpreters have for the most part abandoned it as hopeless and many declare the recovery of the original text impossible.‡ A literal rendering of 𝔐 would yield, "for unto thorns entangled and like their drink soaked, they will be devoured like dry stubble full," or possibly, "fully dry." This has usually been interpreted to mean that even though the foes of Yahweh be, like tangled thorns, difficult and dangerous to approach and be hard to destroy even as drenched thorns are hard to burn, yet before Yahweh's might they will be made to fall as easily as the fire consumes the stubble.§ Others have found in the second clause a slightly different thought, viz. 'like drunkards who fall into the flames as though desiring so to do, they will be consumed, etc..' ** But no translation affording any connected sense is possible within the limits of ordinary grammatical interpretation. The translation here given rests upon a text which is confessedly largely conjectural and, as with all guesses, the chances are against it. Recent interpreters have cut the Gordian knot by dropping the more difficult words as due to dittography (*v. i.*), but this leaves the line with only five beats instead of the six that are required. The poet's imagination pictures the enemies of

---

* So placed also by Bick., Now.^{1}, Or. (?), Arn., Marti, Hpt., Stk., Kau., Kent; while Du. places the whole of v. ^{2} here.

† So *e. g.* Gunk., We., Now.^{2}, Gray, Hap., Dr., van H..

‡ So *e. g.* We., Dav., GASm., Dr., Kau..

§ So *e. g.* Ew., Hi., Hd., Or..

** So *e. g.* Ki., Mau..

Yahweh as a patch of thorns laid low by the sickle and ready for the fire. The same likening of Yahweh's foes to thorns and stubble appears in Is. $33^{11.\,12}$; *cf.* also 2 S. 23^{6} Mi. 7^{4} Is. 10^{17} 27^{4} Ez. 2^{6} Ec. 7^{6}.

The acrostic structure of this section was first noticed in modern times at least, by Pastor G. Frohnmeyer of Lienzingen in Würtemberg. His suggestion was called to the attention of scholars by De. in his commentary on Ps. 9. The discovery was taken up by Bick. who sought to reconstruct vv. $^{2-10}$ on this basis in *ZDMG.* XXXIV (1880), 559 *ff.* and later in his *Carmina V. T. metrice* (1882), 212 *f.*. Bick.'s scheme was peculiar in that he sought the whole alphabet in the successive lines of vv. $^{2.\,10}$, by making the alphabetic arrangement apply not only to the initial letters, but also to the second and third letters of the lines. In his own words, "exquisito artificio alphabetico struitur hoc carmen. Unicuique disticho litera ex ordine alphabeti usque ad mem inclusive praemittitur, sed ea lege, ut Aleph iteretur, et prima ultimaque stropha unicam tantum literam initialem recipiant. Hoc modo in initio secundi distichi literae Nun locus reservatur. Ceterae literae a Samekh usque ad Tav (e quibus Pä, ut saepius, literae ʿAjin praemittitur) literas initiales Bet, Gimel, Dalet, He, Vav ita sequuntur, ut alternatim binae et singulae ponantur; ergo Samekh et Pä post Bet, ʿAjin post Gimel, Çade et Qoph post Dalet, Reš post He, Šin et Tav post Vav." The artificiality of this hypothesis, which is wholly without analogy in Heb., and the violence to the text which is necessary to give it any shade of plausibility kept scholars from adopting it; and Bick. (though he had presented the last str. in revised form [1^{7-10}] in *Zeitschrift für Kathol. Theologie* for 1886), in his last publication on the subject, viz. *Beiträge z. sem. Metrik* (1894) abandoned the scheme himself. The next contribution was from Gunk. in *ZAW.* XIII (1893), 223 *ff.* and also some further suggestions in *Schöpfung und Chaos* (1895), 102 *f.*. He, observing that elsewhere alphabetic poems are carried through the whole alphabet and that 1^{10}–2^{1} was of approximately the same length as 1^{2-9}, proceeded to reconstruct 1^{2}–2^{1} so as to make it yield twenty-two lines, each opening in turn with the letters of the alphabet in their proper order. This involved radical emendations and several transpositions of lines or parts of lines, especially in 1^{10}–2^{1}. The first full statement of the case for English readers was furnished by Gray, *Exp.* 1898, pp. 207–220, who did not attempt to follow Gunk. in the reconstruction of the latter half of the acrostic, concerning which he rightly says, "any particular suggestion can be regarded as little more than a possibility"; but satisfied himself with marshalling the evidence for the acrostic character of the piece as a whole and with contributing a textual suggestion or two of much value. Hap. (1900 and 1902) regards the acrostic form as original rather than as due to an editor as some have suggested and carries it through 2^1, but considers the poem in its present form to be in reality a composite of two poems (viz. 1^{2-10} and 1^{11}–2^1), which have been independently wrought out of the original acrostic which he undertakes to restore. Arn. (1901) subjected the work of his predecessors to a keen criticism and maintained that only a fragment of the original acrostic had been incorporated in ch. 1 and that it is found in 1^{2-10}. In the restoration of this, he proffers some new textual readings and transpositions. Hpt. (1907) likewise makes no attempt to restore the acrostic beyond 1^{10} and adds but little on the acrostic form to the work of his predecessors. Du. (1910) begins the acrostic with 1^3, tr. 1^2 to foll. 1^{9a}, and combines 1^{12} with 1^{10} to form the ס and ע lines with which he stops.

The acrostic structure of 1^{2-10} is too clearly apparent to be a subject of reasonable doubt. Eight of the lines as they stand in 𝔐 offer the desired initial letter, while four or five more are easily recovered by slight emendations and transpositions, some of which are necessary apart from all requirements of the acrostic. This fact is recognised and a reconstruction substantially identical with that given above (pp. 287 *f.*) is adopted by nearly all recent scholars; *e. g.* We., Now., Marti, Dr., Stk., van H., Kau., and Kent. The only doubters are Dav. and GASm.. The former entertains the possibility that the traces of an acrostic are due solely to unconscious and accidental causes; but the recurrence of so many successive letters at regular intervals seems to reduce the possibility of chance or accident to the vanishing-point. The latter scholar wonders how a poem originally clearly indicated as acrostic could have failed of recognition and have suffered mutilation to such an extent as to have lost the semblance of an acrostic. But the fact that Ps. 9 and 10 underwent a somewhat similar transformation is sufficient answer to such an objection.

In the section beginning with 1^{11}, not only are there no sure traces of the acrostic, but the character of the contents undergoes a change. The acrostic concerns itself primarily and almost exclusively with Yahweh and his doings; vv. $^{11\,ff.}$ are clearly addressed to a party of the second part who seems to have been guilty of a great crime against Yahweh and his people. Hence, these two parts of ch. 1 must be treated separately.

It is Gunk.'s merit to have pointed out the distinction in style and tone between ch. 1 and chs. 2, 3. In the latter, the writer is dealing with a definite and concrete political situation; but in the former we have only theological abstractions. The language and ideas here are not those of the prophets, but those of the post-prophetic, eschatological psalmists. The artificial acrostic form is also out of keeping with the vigorous and vital style of Nahum. It points to later times, when such usage was common; *e. g.* Pr. 31^{10-31} Ps. 9, 10, 25, 34, 37, 111, 112, 119, 145. La. 1–4. This section is, therefore, now generally held to be of late origin; so *e. g.* Bick., Gray, We., Now., Hap., Löhr (*ThLZ.* 1901, p. 37), Arn., Marti, Dr., Bu.$^{Gesch.}$, Cor., Hpt., Kau., Du., Kent. The fact that the later addition comes at the beginning of the book rather than at the end, as is more customary, is not altogether without parallel; similar introductions are Gn. 1^{1}–2^{4a}, Dt. 1–5; and some would place Mi. 1^{2-5} in the same category.

2. קַנוא] Only Jos. 24^{19}; a variation from the more usual form קַנָּא.—ונקם י׳] Marti om. ונ׳; so Hpt., Stk., Kau., Kent. Du. om. both words.—נקם יהוה] Om. with 𝔊 as a dittog.; so Gunk., Hap., Now., Du.. Marti om. only י׳; so Hpt., Stk., Ka.. The threefold occurrence of נ׳ greatly exercised the older exegetes; Ra., *e. g.*, saw in it a reflection of the threefold vengeance of י׳, viz. in the beginning of Israel's history, in the prophet's own time, and in the days to come when Israel is to be deported to Babylon. Abar. interpreted it as occasioned by the fact that Assy. had invaded and devastated Israel three times; while Tarnovius, Mich., Geb. and Pu. referred it to the three persons of the Trinity. The om. of נ׳ י׳ here suggested is much simpler than the proposition to drop ונ׳ and the second י׳, even though it does bring the cæsura after the fourth beat instead of the third; such variations in hexameter are not uncommon.—ובעל חמה] 𝔊 *μετὰ θυμοῦ* om. ו; so 𝔖; so also Gunk., Hap., Now.. On this usage of ב׳, *cf.* Pr. 22^{24} 29^{22} and Ges.$^{\S 128\ s.\ u}$; so also Ar. *dhu* = 'possessor of,' 'characterised by.'—ונוטר] 𝔊 *καὶ ἐξαίρων*, nowhere else used to render נ׳, but = נטל in Dn. 7^{4}. 𝔙 *et irascens*. For the same usage of נ׳, with the object אף understood, *v.* Je. $3^{5.\ 12}$ Ps. 103^{9} Lv. 19^{18}; Am. 1^{12}, in its original form, probably presented this vb. with אף expressed (*v.* H.^{AH}, 32). Hpt. would assign נ׳ in all these passages to a נ׳ II = 'be embittered' and = Assy. *natâru*, generally read *nadâru*, and connected with Ar. *muṭirr* (√ מרר) = 'bursting out (of wrath).' New. traced it to an Ar. vb. = 'see' and rendered it 'observeth with an angry eye'; *cf.* מַטָּרָה = 'mark,' 'target' (1 S. 20^{20}).—All who recognise the acrostic character of this passage concede vv. $^{2b.\ 3a}$ to be out of place here; but opinions vary as to the best disposition of them; some treating both lines as glosses, others finding only ^{3a} to be late and placing ^{2b} after the מ line, while others make both lines original, putting $^{3a.\ 2b}$, in reverse order, after the מ line (Bick.), or $^{3a\beta.\ 2b}$ after the מ line (Hpt.), or ^{3a} after the ט line (v. ^{7}) and ^{2b} after מ (Arn.). Du., however, begins the acrostic with v. ^{3}, dropping the initial י׳ and placing v. ^{2} after v. ^{9a}. Every attempt to use ^{3a} as a part of the acrostic involves serious difficulty. To make it supply the shortage in the מ line, demands the arbitrary omission of more than half of ^{3a} in order to bring the completed line within the compass of a hexameter. To place it after the ט line, likewise calls for some pruning of ^{3a} which is, as it stands, too long for a line, and it also involves the omission of ביום צ׳ from v. ^{7} which has to be crowded into a single line. Du.'s proposition involves an irregular order of words for

^{3a}, after the initial 'י has been dropped for the purpose of the acrostic; the nominal sentence calls for its subject at the beginning rather than at the end.—**3.** כח] Rd. חֶסֶד, with Gunk ; so Now., Kau.; *cf.* Jo. 2^{13} Jon. 4^{2} Ex. 34^{6} Ps. 103^{8} 145^{8}.—ונקה לא ינקה] 𝕲 *καὶ ἀθῷον οὐκ ἀθῳώσει.* 𝖀 *et mundans non faciet innocentem.* The phrase is found also in Ex. 34^{7} Nu. 14^{18}; *cf.* Ex. 20^{7} Je. 30^{11}. Hpt. supplies an obj. עָוֹן, in place of 𝕸's יהוה; but 'נ requires a personal obj., not an abstraction.—יהוה] 𝕲 treats as subj. of ינקה. Gunk., Hap., Marti, and Kau. om. as a gloss.—בסופה] 𝕲 *ἐν συντελείᾳ.*—ובשערה] Jb. 9^{17}. A dialectic variation from סְעָרָה, which Gunk. would substitute. The same alliterative conjunction of סופה and סערה occurs in Is. 29^{6} Ps. 83^{16}.—וענן] 𝕲 𝖀 pl..—אבק רגליו] Gunk. יֵאָבֵק לְרגליו; so Bick., van H..—**4.** גוער] Some mss. of Kenn. גָּעַר; so We., Now., Hal.. The prtc. shows that the reference is not to any single act, but to the regular and continuous activity of 'י along these lines. As the continuation of the prtc. by the impf. shows, the prtc. here describes a permanent characteristic of 'י, one demonstrated by long-established experience.—ויבשהו] Gunk. וַיַּבֵּשׁ; so Stk.. We. וַיְיַבְּשֵׁהוּ; so Marti, Now.^{K}, van H., Kau.. But this was probably a recognised and legitimate contraction of the full form, the weak י being elided just as is the ה of Niph., Hiph. and Hoph. impfs.. For other cases, *v.* La. $3^{33.\ 53}$; *cf.* Ges.$^{\S\,69\,u}$.—אֻמְלַל] Rd. דָּלַל, with Gray, Dr., Du.. The acrostic calls for an initial ד here. 𝕸 has 'א at both the beginning and the end of the line; but the Vrss. without exception seem to point to different vbs. in the two places; at least, they have different renderings. 𝕲 has *ὠλιγώθη . . . ἐξέλιπεν*; 𝖀 *infirmatus est . . . elanguit;* 𝕿 צדו . . . נתרו; 𝕾 ܐܬܡܟ . . . . ܡܟ. In accordance with not infrequent usage elsewhere, this might be explained as due to a desire for variation. But against such an explanation here is (1) the fact that the translators here were not zealous for variety, for in 1^{6} זעם and חרון are rendered by the same word by both 𝕲 (ὀργή) and 𝕾; (2) the variety exists in *all* the Vrss.; (3) the acrostic calls for ד; (4) the use of words for 'א by 𝕲 𝕾 which never occur elsewhere as its equivalents. Among the many Heb. originals of 𝕲's frequent rendering ἐκλειπειν, the one that best suits this situation is דלל which is represented by this vb. in 𝕲's rendering of Is. 38^{14} and in the Niph. is rendered by the noun ἔκλειψις in Is. 17^{4}. This, however, gives us 'ד at the end of the line instead of the beginning where it is needed. When the oldest Vrss. (𝕲 𝕾) were made, it is quite clear that the opening word of the line was אמלל, for the renderings of these two bear indisputable testimony to that fact. But, if a scribe depended largely upon his memory, not slavishly eyeing his copy, the resemblance in both form and meaning between 'א and 'ד might easily have occasioned their interchange; *cf.* the similar transpositions in Mi. 1^{2} 𝕲 and Na. 1^{6} 𝕾. That דלל might fittingly be applied to Bashan and Carmel, fertile regions, would appear from Is. 19^{6} where it is parallel to חרבו and is used of streams, Is. 17^{4} where it is used of the glory of Jacob, and the later Heb. where it denotes the thinning out of vine-leaves. *Cf.* Gray's excellent statement of these facts. Bick.^{1} רָצַק. Buhl, אכל. Gunk. דָאֵב; so Bick.^{3}, We., Or., Hap., Now., Hpt., van H.. *CB.* דַּל ירחמאל. Arn. דָּכְאוּ. Kau. דָאַג.—בשן] 𝔗 מתנן; so 𝔖. *CB.* וְיָשַׁן.—**5.** הרים] 𝔊 *τὰ ὄρη*; so 𝔗; hence Marti, הֶהָרִים; so Now.^{K}, Kent, Du.. But the art. is not necessary even though the parallel noun has it; the use of art. with one noun when a co-ordinate noun is anarthrous is not uncommon; *cf.* Mi. 1$^{4.\ 6}$ 3^{3} 4$^{1.\ 10}$. Further, the art. occurs only once in an acrostic as a member of the alphabetic series, viz. La. 4^{5}.—והגבעות] Gunk. וכל הג׳; so Gray, Kol., Now..—ותשא] Rd. וַתִּשָּׁא, Niph. √ שאה (*cf.* 𝔗 וַחֲרִיבַת), which furnishes good sense and occurs in a similar context in Is. 6^{11}; so also Capellus, Gunk., Gray, Or. (?), Marti, Now.^{K}, Dr., *HWB.*^{15}, Hpt., Kau.; *cf.* Houb. ותשאה (so New.). 𝔊 *καὶ ἀνεστάλη.* Aq. *ἔφριξε.* Σ. *ἐκινήθη.* 𝔙 *contremuit;* so 𝔖. Bick.^{1} וְשָׁת. Bick.^{2} וַתֵּשָׁא; so Now.. BDB. וַתֵּשֶׁא; so van H.. Gr. ותגעש. Kau. וַיִּשָּׂא. Oort$^{Em.}$ וַתִּשָּׁא. Hap. וַתִּנָּשֵׂא. Du. וַתָּשַׁח (*cf.* Hb. 3^{6}). 𝔐 calls for an intransitive rendering of נשא. Passages commonly cited in support of this are Ho. 13^{1} Hb. 1^{3} Ps. 24^{9} 89^{10}; but Ho. 13^{1} is corrupt (*v.* H.^{AH}, *ad loc.*), Hb. 1^{3} probably so, Ps. 24^{9} should be corrected after 24^{7}, and in Ps. 89^{10} the intransitive sense is not necessary. We should also expect נ׳, if intransitive, to be followed by מִתַּחְתָּיו rather than מפניו. 𝔊 Σ. seem to have read the Niph. impf. of נשׂא; Aq., 𝔖 𝔙 perhaps gave a free rendering of the same form; but 𝔗 connected it with שׁאה, 'be waste.'—ותבל] Om. ו with 𝔊 𝔖; so We., Gunk., Gray, Hap., Now., Marti, Hal., Hpt., Kau.. For similar asyndetic construction, *v.* Je. 34^{1} Ps. 24^{1} 98^{7}. 𝔊 *ἡ σύμπασα.*—לפני ז׳ מי י׳ ומי] Rd. זעמו מי י׳ לפניו מי; so Bick., Gunk., We., Gray, Or., Hap., Now., Marti, Dr., Hpt., Stk., van H., Kent, Du.. The relation between this line and the ח line is so close that it is evident that this line stood in immediate proximity to the latter. The key-word in the acrostic is ז׳; hence ל׳ must be transposed. Arn.'s objection to this transposition is not well taken, viz. that מי י׳ לפניו would mean "who can stand before him?", thus leaving ז׳ unrelated. ז׳ is grammatically masc. (Is. 10^{25}); hence the masc. sf. refers to it naturally. In any case, Arn.'s substitution of יָכִיל for יעמד is too violent a change. But Arn.'s explanation of the position of לפני in 𝔐 as due to the fact that the writer was quoting from memory here is probably correct; *cf.* the place of נכון in Is. 2^{2} with its place in the duplicate, Mi. 4^{1}.—ומי] The detachment of ו to complete לפני leaves מי as a proclitic to be pronounced with יקום and thus improves the metre.—נתכה] 𝔊 *τήκει.* Aq. *συνεχωνεύθη.* Σ Θ *ἔσταξεν.* 𝔏 *fluere facit.* We., with 𝔖, tr. נ׳ and נתצו, reading them נצתה and נתכו; so Hal.. Kenn. 225 reads נצתו; so Mich., Gunk., Bick., Gray, Now., Marti, Hpt., Kau., *HWB.*^{15}. But We.'s objection that נתכה is not suitable before כאש is ill-founded, in view of Je. 7^{20} where the ideas of 'pouring' and 'burning' are conjoined in reference to Yahweh's wrath; so also in Je. 44^6 2 Ch. 34^{25}. Nor is the difficulty with נתצו] serious; the vb. is commonly used of the breaking down of walls, doors, cities, towns, etc.; there is no inherent difficulty in applying it to rocks; it is surely as easy to think of the 'breaking down' or 'pulling down' of rocks as it is of the 'burning' of them; indeed, there is no example of this latter idea in the OT.. For the idiom נתץ מן, *cf.* Je. 4^{26}.—כאש] 𝔊 *ἀρχάς*; so 𝔏. Hence Gr. ראש.—ממנו] 𝔖 = מִמֶּנָּה; so Gunk., Bick., Now. (?). The reference of the sf. is ambiguous, for אש occurs both as masc. and as fem..—**7.** למעוז] Rd. לְקֹוָיו מָעוֹז; *cf.* 𝔊 *τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν αὐτόν*; 𝔙 *et confortans;* 𝔗 *to Israel that they may stay themselves;* 𝔖 *to strengthen.* This insertion is supported by (1) 𝔊, which has one of the more frequent equivalents of קוה; (2) 𝔗, which probably had לק׳ as a basis for its 'Israel' and מ׳ as the original of its 'stay themselves'; (3) the need of another beat in the line. This reading (or לקויו למ׳) is accepted by Bick., Gunk., We., Dav., GASm., Gray, Or., Now., Hal., Marti, Dr., Hpt., Stk., Kau., Kent. The phrase טוב י׳ לק׳ occurs also in La. 3^{25}; *cf.* Ps. 25^3 37^9 69^7 86^5 Is. 40^{31} 49^{23}. Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$ substitutes לקויו for למעוז. Bick. (1894) לְעֹזֵי במעוזו; *cf.* Hap. לְעֹזֵי בו למעוז; but the idiom עזי בו does not occur elsewhere. Van H. לִמְקַוִּים לו מעוז הוא. Du. לִמְקַוָּיו למעוז. Hpt. would derive מעוז from עזז with the Massoretes, rather than from עוז (*cf.* Ges.$^{\S\,85\,k}$); but the latter root suits the usage of the noun better. This is the only example of a מ formation from an ע״ו root which retains â under the preformative when inflectional additions are made and also doubles the last radical, *e. g.* מָעֻזִּי. The doubled radical, of course, does not necessarily presuppose an ע״ע root, since it may be only an equivalent for the naturally long vowel (*e. g.* פִּלֶגֶשׁ and פִּילֶגֶשׁ). 𝔐 vacillates on this point; *cf.* מָעוּזִּי, 2 S. 22^{33}; מָעוּזִּי, Ps. 31^5 43^2; מָעוּזּוֹ, Is. 17^9 Ps. 52^9; מָעוּזָּם, Ps. 37^{39}; מָעֻזֵּי, Dn. $11^{11.\,19}$. The â is just as abnormal in the one case as the other, מָגֵן furnishing the only example of its retention in the case of an ע״ע noun. *Cf.* Brockelmann, *Vergl. Gramm.* pp. 103, 375; Barth, *NB.* § 158 b; Nö. *Syr. Gram.* § 126 G.—ביום צרה] Arn. om. as gloss. Du. ב׳ צ׳ וְהוּ י׳.—וידע] Rd. יֹדֵעַ יהוה, with Bick., Gunk., We., Hap., Now., Marti, Hpt., Stk., van H., Kau., Kent. Gray, Or., Dr., Du., om. ו, but do not add י׳.—חסי] 𝔊 *τοὺς εὐλαβουμένους.*—**8.** ובשטף עבר] 𝔊 *καὶ ἐν κατακλυσμῷ πορείας.* 𝔖 apparently tr. ע׳ and the foll. יעשה; though this appearance is probably due to an inner Syr. corruption. Bick. originally (1880) added כָּלָה; but later יִשְׁמְרֵם; so van H.. Hap. om. ע׳. Gunk. adds ימלטם or יַצִּילֵם; so We., Gray, Now., Marti, Hpt., Kau., Kent. Du. changes ע׳ to יַעֲבִירֵם.—מקומה] Rd. בְּקָמָיו; so Buhl (*ZAW.* V), Gunk., Oort, Or., Now., Hap., Marti, Dr., Hpt., Stk., van H., Kau., Kent. Du.. The sf. of 𝔐 lacks any antecedent here. Parallels for a second acc. after עשה כלה are furnished by Je. 30^{11} Ne. 9^{31}. But the similarity of בקמיו to מקומה is very close; for other interchanges of ב and מ, *cf.* בראדך for מרדך in 2 K. 20^{12};

אמנה and אבנה in Qr. and Kt. of 2 K. 5^{12} (*cf.* 𝔊 𝔖 𝔗); רימון and דיבון Is. 15^{9} (*cf.* 𝔙), Jos 15^{22} Ne. 11^{25}; and the local pronunciation of Baalbek, which is scarcely distinguishable from Maalbek. Such confusion is also clearly attested by 𝔊, *e. g.* Ho. 10^{6} ירב, 𝔊 Ἰαρείμ; 13^{9} בי, 𝔊 𝔖 = מי; Am. 6^{7} בראש, 𝔊 = מֵראשׁ; Mi. 7^{17} מִמִּסג׳, 𝔊 = בְּמִסְג׳. *Cf.* also Dl. *Assy. Gram.* § 44; Kö. II, i, p. 459. For עשה כלה with ב, *cf.* Je. $30^{11} = 46^{28}$ 𝔊 *τοὺς ἐπεγειρομένους*; similarly Θ. Aq. *ἀπὸ ἀνισταμένων*. 𝔈′. *a consurgentibus illi.* 𝔖 *to its place.* 𝔗 לכל עממיא דְּקָמוּ. 𝔊 Aq Θ. E′. and 𝔗 all treat it as a designation of persons rather than place or things. Gre. מְקִימְמָיו. Houb. בקומיו. New. בקוממיו. Dathe, לִמְקִימָיו; so Bauer, Br.. Jus. קָמָיו (so Hap.) or מהקוממיו (so Gr., We.; *cf.* Hpt.). Hal. בְּנִינְוֵה.—ירדף ח׳] Acc. of end of motion as in 1 S. 23^{25}. We.[1] ינדף ח׳ or ידף. Gunk. יֶהְדֹּף ח׳; so We.[3], Gray, Now., Marti, Stk., van H., Kau., Du.; *cf.* Jb. 18^{18}. Hpt. יהדף אֶל ח׳.—**9.** תחשבון] Gunk. adds רָעָה; similarly Now.^{K}.—אל] 𝔊 *ἐπί*; so 𝔖 𝔙; hence Gunk. על; so Hpt., Du.. But אל has the force of על in Ho. 7^{15} Je. 49^{20} 50^{45}.—כָּלָה הוא עשה] Rd. כִּי עַד כָּלָה הוא עשׂה, the first two words of which are from v. [10] where they are unintelligible; so Marti, Or. (?), Now.^{K}, Hpt., Stk. (all of whom also change כ׳ to כַּלֵּה; *cf.* 2 K. $13^{17.19}$ Ezr. 9^{14} 2 Ch. 31^{1} BS. 10^{13}), and Du.. The attempt of Dav. to find the meaning 'even though' for עד and so make כי עד intelligible where it is in 𝔐 rests upon Nu. 8^{4} 1 S. 2^{5} Hg. 2^{19} Jb. 25^{5}, all of which present a questionable text and in none is the meaning 'though' satisfactory even if it were permissible. The change to כַּלֵּה is quite unnecessary, even though it makes excellent sense. Now. substitutes יעשה for הוא ע׳, treating הוא as due to dittog. of ה in כ׳ and corruption of י.—תקום] Rd. יִקּוֹם, with 𝔊 *ἐκδικήσει*; so Gunk., Gray, Hap., Now., Marti, Dr. (?), Hpt., Stk., Kau., Kent. Van H. יָקוּם. Σ. *οὐχ ἀνθυποστήσονται τὴν ἐπανάστασιν.*—פעמים צרה] Rd. פ׳ בְּצָרָיו; so Gunk., Gray, Now., Hap., Marti, Dr. (?), van H., Stk., Kau., Kent. Hpt. מְצָרָיו. After the final ם of פ׳, the om. of the similarly sounding ב was easy (*v.* on v. [8]).—**10.** כי עד] *V.* on. v. [9]. Gunk. tr. to foll. עָשָׂה in 9^{b}; so Bick., but reading כמועד (accepted by Gunk. in *Schöpfung u. Chaos*, 102). Arn. om. as gloss.—סירים סבכים וכסבאם סבואים] Rd. סירים כְּסֻחִים וּצְמֵאִים. 𝔐 seems to be due to corruption and conflation. It embodies two efforts to restore a corrupt text. One interpreting סירים as 'thorns' restored סבכים; the other, taking it as 'pots,' restored וכסבאם וסבאים, on the basis of Ho. 4^{18}. The reference later in the context to stubble and burning makes the interpretation 'thorns' much the more probable. Starting with this we can restore כסחים, on the basis of 𝔊, the remnants of 𝔐, and Is. 33^{12}; so Gunk., Marti, Dr. (?), Stk. (though Marti, Stk., add יָלְלוּ). The further correction וצמאים presupposes a confusion of מ and ב (*v.* on v. [8]) and of צ and ס (*cf.* ישׂחק and יצחק), and drops כסבאם as due either to a gloss or to dittog. (for the om., *cf.* Gunk., Gr., Oort$^{Em.}$, Hap., Marti, Hpt., Kent). צבא is applied to land in Is. 44^{3} and to foliage in Dt. 29^{18}, hence may be used appropriately of thorns. 𝔊 *θεμελίου(-ων*, HP. 228) *αὐτοῦ(-ῶν*, 𝔊^{Y}; *-ῆς*, 𝔊$^{א\text{c. a. c. b.}}$ 𝔖^{H}) *χερσωθήσεται(-ονται*, 𝔊^{A} HP. 22, 36, 51, 62, 86, 95, 97, 147, 153, 185) *καὶ ὡς σμίλαξ περιπλεκομένη* = . . . סרים כסחים וכ׳. Σ. *ὁμοίως στοιβῇ συμπεπλεγμένη οὕτως καὶ τὸ συμπόσιον αὐτῶν συμπινόντων ἀλλήλοις.* 𝔙 *sicut spinae se invicem complectuntur sic convivium eorum pariter potantium.* 𝔖 = שָׁרִים סִיְרִים וּבסבאם ס׳; similarly 𝔗. Gr. שָׂרִים סבואים ובסבאם. Arn. om. סירים as a gloss and reads סְבָכִים וכן סבואים. Oort$^{Em.}$ יְסוֹדִים סבכים כַּסֹּבֶךְ. Hal. כְּעַרְעָרִים וְכִסְנָאִים סְנוּאִים. Hpt. ס׳ סבואים כִּי הֵמָּה. Van H. סְבוּכִים כְּסִירִים. Du. סירים סְבֻכִים אַךְ לוֹ, using the foll. אכלו, and tr. וכס׳ ס׳ to the end of verse where it is to be read הוֹ סְבַךְ לְבִיאִים מָלֵא. Hpt. takes סירים as = 'pots' here and treats סבכים as a gloss by one who misinterpreted it as 'thorns' and כסבאם as another gloss = 'even if they drink,' the original text being סירים סבואים = 'jars filled with wine.' This is treated as a figurative characterisation of the drunkards Antiochus Epiphanes and his nephew, Demetrius I. But aside from the improbability of a Maccabaean date for this material and the inappropriateness of burning as a method of destroying jars, the pl. of סיר 'pot' is elsewhere סִירוֹת.—אכלו] *Cf.* Ex. 15^{7}. 𝔊 *βρωθήσεται(-ονται*, HP. 22, 36, 51, 95, 97, 153, 185). Σ. *ἀναλωθήσεται.* Gunk. יִכָּלוּ. Hap.'s suggestion that the original text thus far was כִּי עַד סֹבֶךְ אֻכָּלוּ, represented by 𝔊 *ὡς σμίλαξ κ.τ.λ.*, and that סירים . . . כסב׳ סב׳ are variants or glosses, is beset by two serious difficulties; viz. (1) the use of עַד as a particle denoting comparison is without any parallel in the OT., 1 Ch. 4^{27} certainly not being such a case; (2) it seems rather reckless to eliminate the ס line, leaving a blank, when סירים presents itself at the right place in 𝔐.—יבש] Comp., *ξηρανθήσεται.* Hap. יבשו. Marti, באש; so Hpt., Stk..—מלא] Rd. הֲלֹא and join with v. ^{11}; so We., GASm., Arn., Marti, Dr., Now.^{K}, Hpt.(?). 𝔖 = מְלֵאוּ. Gr. מלל. Gunk. יִבָּלוּ (*cf.* Ps. 37^{2}). Hal. as an abbreviation of מִלְשׁוֹן אֵשׁ.

§ 3. WORDS OF COMFORT TO JUDAH ($1^{12.\ 13}$ $2^{1.\ 3}$).

An eight-line str. declaring that the yoke of Israel's oppressor is broken and the period of her affliction is complete. Deliverance and restoration now await the people of God. This section constitutes a later addition to the prophecy of Nahum.

Thus saith Yahweh:—

VERILY, the days of my contention are completed; yea, indeed, they are over and gone.
I have afflicted thee, but I will afflict thee no more.

And now I will break his rod from upon thee, and thy bonds I will burst asunder.
Behold, upon the mountains the feet of a herald, of one proclaiming peace!
Celebrate thy feasts, O Judah, fulfil thy vows;
For not again will the destroyer pass through thee; he will be destroyed, cut off.
For Yahweh will restore the vine of Jacob, likewise the vine of Israel;
Though the despoilers have despoiled them, and their branches they have destroyed.

12. *Thus saith Yahweh*] This phrase is extraneous to the str. but is not on that account necessarily a later, editorial addition.* It furnishes the necessary antecedent of the pronouns in the first person which follow.—*Verily, the days of my contention are completed; yea, indeed, they are over and gone*] For text, *v. i.*. 𝔐 is very difficult, if not impossible. RV. renders, "though they be in full strength, and likewise many, even so shall they be cut down, and he shall pass away." The manifest defects of this are, (1) שלמים = 'whole,' 'perfect,' 'sound,' etc., and 'in full strength' is somewhat forced; (2) וכן can hardly be rendered "and likewise," which would be better expressed by וגם; (3) the pronouns 'they' and 'he' are loosely related to the context, the former in particular finding no satisfactory antecedent. Most of the older interpreters found here an allusion to the invasion of Sennacherib, *e. g.* "if they (*i. e.* the Assyrians) were once intact and so many and yet were so mown down and he (*i. e.* Sennacherib) passed away."† But the allusions are too indefinite and the transition to Sennacherib too abrupt to render this plausible. Renderings involving textual changes are numerous, *e. g.* "may the great waters be ever so full, they will yet come to naught and pass away,"‡ but שלם is nowhere else used of the overflowing of waters; "how high the tide was soever, it has ebbed and subsided,"§ but the OT. knows nothing of 'tides' and as a matter of fact the tide on the coast of Palestine is insignificant; "they will be divided like the great waters,"** but this involves the arbitrary omission of several words and the violent transposition of others. The translation given here rests upon a text largely conjectural, but its departure from 𝔐 is comparatively slight. For the figure of Yahweh's controversy with Israel, *cf.* Ho. 4^1 12^2 Mi. 6^2 Je. 25^{31}. The thought is that the period during which Yahweh has constantly been under the necessity of punishing Judah for its sins has now come to an end; a new dispensation may now be expected from him. An alternative rendering, resting upon a slightly different text, may be suggested, viz. "many days have been completed, they are come to an end and have passed away"; *i. e.* the long-drawn-out time of affliction, which seemed as though it would never end, is now finished.—*I have afflicted thee, but I will afflict thee no more*] This is a plain prose statement of the meaning of the preceding, somewhat figurative words. The address is to Judah,* if this translation be adopted. But as the text stands in 𝔐, the more natural rendering is, "and I will afflict thee so that I need not afflict thee again"; in which case the address is to Nineveh or Assyria† and the meaning is that Yahweh is about to destroy Nineveh utterly, once for all.—**13.** *And now I will break his rod from upon thee, and thy bonds I will burst asunder*] 𝔐 has 'yoke' for 'rod,' but the form is difficult. The figure is that of a taskmaster standing over the slave with uplifted stick, forcing him to work; *cf.* Is. 9^4 $10^{5.\,24}$ Ps. 2^9 Rev. 2^{27} 12^5 19^{15}. The oppressor referred to is the power that happened to be in dominion over Judah at the time this was written; perhaps it was Persia. If the reading 'yoke' be correct, the 'bonds' will be the thongs holding the two sides of the yoke together; *cf.* Ps. 2^3 Je. 30^8 Ez. 30^{18} 34^{27} Is. 28^{22}.—**2^1.** *Behold, upon the mountains the feet of a herald, one proclaiming peace*] *Cf.* Is. 40^9 52^7. In striking fashion, the prophet pictures deliverance and safety as at the very doors. The reference to the mountains probably finds its significance in the custom of signalling tidings from one hill-top to another; *cf.* Is. 5^{26} $13^{2\,\text{ff.}}$ 49^{22}. The word rendered 'peace' is a comprehensive term, including that which goes with peace, viz. prosperity and freedom from anxiety.—*Celebrate thy feasts, O Judah, fulfil thy vows*] These are the words of the messenger. The joyous festal occasions thus far intermittently observed because of the inroads of the invader, may now be regularly resumed. The many vows that have been made in the effort to win the favour of God for the afflicted people are now due. It is characteristic that the religious duties of the nation are the first thought in the writer's mind. The deliverance will be wrought by God; the first obligation of the rescued people is to him. —*For not again will the destroyer pass through thee*] *Cf.* Jo. $2^{19.26\,f.}$ 3^{17} Zc. 9^{8}. The abstract "ruin" is used in the text for the concrete "destroyer." The oppressive tyrant is thus represented as ruin incarnate. On the rendering "Belial," *v. i.*.—*He will be destroyed, cut off*] 𝔐 has "he will be wholly cut off." In either case, a complete destruction is intended. The oppressor is now himself to meet the fate that he has dealt out so freely to others.—**3.** *For Yahweh will restore the vine of Jacob, likewise the vine of Israel*] 𝔐 has "pride" in both instances for "vine"; but the following line demands the mention of a vine here as the antecedent of its thought. The words 'vine' and 'pride' in Hebrew vary only in one consonant; hence confusion in copying was easy. For the same figure, *cf.* Gn. 49^{22} Ho. 10^{1} Is. 5^{2-7} Je. 2^{21} 48^{32} Ps. $80^{8.14}$. Some would treat the references to Israel as a variant of the preceding Jacob; but the hope of the restoration of both branches of the people was vivid in postexilic Israel (*e. g.* Is. $11^{12\,ff.}$ Zc. $10^{6\,ff.}$ Ob. $^{18\,ff.}$) and may well have found expression here. For 'Jacob' = 'Judah,' *cf.* Is. 43^{1} 44^{1} 46^{3} Ob. ^{18}. The verb is better taken as a prophetic perfect relating to the future than as a historical perfect stating what has already taken place.* If the reading "pride" be retained, it will be used in its good sense, viz. honour, self-respect, glory.—*Though devastators have devastated them and laid waste their branches*] The pronouns refer to Jacob and Israel. The force of the opening conjunction is dubious; it may be concessive, as here taken, and indicate that the present desolate condition of Israel is no obstacle in the way of the exercise of Yahweh's favour; or it may be causal or explanatory, giving the reason for the necessity of the promised restoration. The calamities of the past are likened to the ruthless devastation of a luxuriant vine, as in Is. $16^{7.8}$. Efforts to interpret the figure on all-fours have not been wanting, *e. g.* the branches designate the fair community;† or the vineyard is the land of Canaan, the vines are the families of Israel and the branches are the individual members of the various families.‡

---

* *Contra* Gunk., Hap., Now., Hpt..

† Ew.; similarly Mau., Ke., Hi., Hd., Or., GASm..

‡ We..

§ Hpt..

** Hap..

---

* So *e. g.* Ki., Mau., Ke., Hd., Or., Gunk., Marti, Kent, *et al.*.

† So *e. g.* Hi., We., GASm., Dr..

---

* *Contra* GASm. who renders, "has turned the pride of Jacob like to the pride of Israel."

† Ew..

‡ Hi..

The relation of these verses to their context has been thus stated by We.: "In the verses with even numbers, Assy. or Nineveh is addressed; in those with odd numbers, Judah or Zion. This change in the address verse by verse is intolerable. The connection which is represented by $1^{12.\,14}$ $2^{2.\,4\,ff.}$ is interrupted by 1^{13} $2^{1.\,3}$; these verses have been inserted." This conclusion, first clearly drawn by We., though the interchange of the parties addressed had long been recognised, has been accepted by nearly all succeeding interpreters; so *e. g.* Dav., Now., GASm., Rub., Arn., Marti, Löhr (*ThLZ.* 1901, p. 37), Hpt., van H., Ka., Kent. Some would include v. ^{12} in the interpolation, as is done above; a decision upon this point is dependent upon the text adopted for the verse (*v. i.*). The incompatibility of this material with its context has been recognised also by Gunk. and Gray; while Stk. eliminates 1^{13} 2^{3}, Dr. concedes 2^{3} as at least misplaced, and Hal. seeks to secure harmony by placing 1^{14} before 1^{13} and 2^{3} before 2^{2}. On the other hand, Du. finds the real beginning of the prophecy of Nahum in $1^{12.\,13.\,14\,\text{(partly)}}$ $2^{1.\,3}$.

The unity of this group of verses is open to question. They all, indeed, reflect the same general tone and point of view. They are full of expectation and hope for Judah; they seem to presuppose the exile; and they concern themselves with the upbuilding of Zion, while Nahum's interest is in the fall of Nineveh. But though occupying this common ground, their inner connection is not as close as would be expected in a unified poem. The connection between 1^{13} and 2^{1}, as also between 2^{1} and 2^{3}, is loose. The possibility that this is a group of more or less independent glosses added by one or more editors must be allowed.

Gunk., Hap., *et al.* argue for the inclusion of this material in the foregoing acrostic. But the tone of the verses as they stand is in sharp contrast to that of the acrostic. Not only so, but all attempts to incorporate them in the acrostic have involved such radical emendations and transpositions of text that doubt and discredit are thrown upon them and that Dav.'s dictum regarding the acrostic as a whole, viz. "the attempt to restore it can never be more than an academic exercise," has certainly been justified for 1^{11}–2^{3}.

The time when $1^{12.\,13}$ $2^{1.\,3}$ originated can be only vaguely conjectured. They look back upon a long period of suffering and forward to the dawn of a new era. They anticipate the immediate cessation of Judah's afflictions with the concomitant entrance of the Messianic era of peace and power. It is questionable whether any portion of the postexilic age was wholly devoid of such hopes. Suffering was the common lot of Israel all through this period. As the vassal of one or another of the great world-powers, her pride was continually humbled and she was as continually looking and longing for deliverance. At times, the Messianic hope burned brightly, *e. g.* in the days of Zerubbabel. These verses probably reflect some such period as that when the world-power of the day seemed to be tottering to its fall and the hopes of faithful Israel were kindled to fresh vigour. The fall of Nineveh, to which Nahum confidently looked forward, can hardly have occasioned such vivid and certain confidence of immediate relief for Israel as these verses reflect; for at that time Assy. power in Syria had long come to an end and Judah was under the heel of Egypt.

1^{12}. כה אמר י׳] Van H. נְאֻם י׳, in order to obtain a נ line.—אם־שלמים וכן רבים] Rd. אַךְ שָׁלְמוּ יְמֵי רִיבִי, with Gunk. (= יִשְׁלְמוּ) as modified by Marti; so Now.^{K}, Kent. For a similar idiom, *cf.* Is. 60^{20}. With a slight variation, we might remain a little closer to 𝔐, viz. אך שלמו יָמִים רַבִּים. In either case וכן is to be om. as due to dittog. from the foll. וכן; so 𝔊 𝔖 and Gr., Gunk., Rub. (*PSBA*. XX, 173 *ff.*), Hap., Marti, Hpt.. 𝔐's אם is due to confusion of מ and כ (*v.* on v. ^{8}). To om. אם (so Marti, Now.^{K}, Kent), makes it difficult to explain its presence in the text. 𝔊 testifies to its presence in some form. שלמו and the two foll. vbs. are in the present pf.; *cf.* Ges.^{§106g}. 𝔊 *κατάρχων ὑδάτων πολλῶν*, which Schleus. would emend to *κατ' ἀρχῶν κ.τ.λ.*; *cf.* 𝔖 *concerning the heads* (*or tops*) *of the waters.* Gr. גם וגו׳. We. אִם שׁ׳ מַיִם רַבִּים. Rub. אֲמַשֵּׁל מַיִם רַבִּים, which he renders "I shall cause many waters to flow." Hap. משל מים. Van H. משֵּׁל מָרוֹם, as an attribute of י׳. Hpt. אם מים מלאים. Du., om. everything between שׁ׳ and וענ׳, reads אִם שָׁלֵם יָם עֲנִתֵּךְ.—(נ׳) וכן] Rd. אָכֵן, the asseverative particle. For א׳ in the middle of a sentence, *cf.* Is. 40^{7} Je. 3^{23}; and for the succession אך . . . אכן, *cf.* Is. $45^{14.\ 15}$. For a somewhat analogous confusion of אכן and פן, *cf.* 1 K. 11^{2} 𝔊. Rub. וָכֹן = 'quickly,' a word made to order on the basis of Ar. *wakana*, 'run quickly.' Gunk. treats כֵּן as a noun and the subj. of the foll. vb..—ונגזו] Rd. יָגֹזוּ, 𝔐 being due to dittog. of final ן in וכן; so Gr., Marti, Now.^{K}, Kent. Many mss. of Kenn. and de R. נגזו. 𝔊 *διασταλήσονται.* 𝔖. ܕܓܙܘ, 'which carry off' (taking it transitively as in Nu. 11^{31}). New. גזל. Hap. נגזרו. Gunk. (*Schöpfung*, 102) נגזו. We. יָגוזוּ, or יִזָּרוּ (so *CB*., Now.). 𝔐's נ׳ is *ἅπ.*, a Niph. of גזז. For גָּזַז = 'pass away,' *cf.* Ps. 90^{10}; it is better as pf. (prophetic pf., if necessary) than as impf. (We.).—ועבר] Not improbably a gloss upon the rare word גזו. 𝔊 om.; so Hap.. 𝔖 𝔗 pl.; so Buhl, Gr., We., Rub., Dav., Oort$^{Em.}$, Now., Or., GASm., Marti, Hal., Hpt., van H., Kau., Kent., Du.. If retained, it must be read as pl.. On waw conjunctive, *v.* Dr.^{§131}.—ועּנתך לא אענך עוד] Tr. ו to precede לא. 𝔊 *καὶ ἀκοήσου οὐκ ἐνακουσθήσεται ἔτι.* 𝔙 om. ו; so Buhl, Oort, Or., Now., GASm., Gray, Arn., Marti, Hpt., Stk.. Rub. וענתך לא רֵעֲנֶה עוד = 'and the sound of thy name will no longer resound.' Hap. ענתם לא אענם עוד. Hal. עֱנוּתֵךְ = 'thine affliction I will bring upon thee now.'—Arn. seeks the ש line of the acrostic in this verse and secures it by om. אִם. But while "Intact and ever so many" may be good English, it is poor Heb.; and the idea of indefinite number would not be expressed by ר׳ וּכֵן. Hap. secures the נ line here, but only by the arbitrary om. of vv. $^{11.\ 12a}$ in order that נג׳ may be brought to the beginning of the line.—**13.** מֹטֵּהוּ] Rd. מַטֵּהוּ, with 𝔊 τὴν ῥάβδον αὐτοῦ; so 𝔙 *virgam ejus* and some mss. of Kenn. and de R.; so also Now., Or., Arn., Hap., Hpt., Kau., *HWB.*^{15}. 𝔐's pointing is a mixed form, combining מוֹטוֹ and מַטֵּהוּ. מוט, in the sense of 'yoke' occurs nowhere else, the regular form being מוֹטָה, which with the sf. gives מוֹטָתוֹ in sg. and מוֹטֹתָיו in pl.. מַטֵּהוּ suits the foll. מֵעָלַיִךְ just as well as מוט does, is an appropriate object of אשבר (*cf.* Zc. 11$^{10\ f.}$) and is nearer 𝔐 than either of the normal forms of מֹט is. מוסרות, which is frequently connected with מוטה to designate the thongs which hold the two bars of the yoke together, is not always so used (*e. g.* Jb. 12^{18} Ps. 116^{16}); hence it constitutes no convincing argument for the presence of מֹט or מוטה here. We. מוֹטוֹ. Or. מוֹטָתוֹ. Gunk. מֹטוֹתַיִךְ. Marti, מוֹטֹתָיו; so Kau. (?). Van H. מַטֵּךְ. Stk. מֹטוֹת; so Du..—מעליך] 𝔊 ἀπὸ σοῦ. 𝔙 *de torso tuo.* Reinke, מִמֵּךְ. Hpt. om.; so van H.. Stk. עָלֵךְ; so Du..—מוסרתיך] 𝔊 om. sf.. Hap. ־ֵיהֶם.—This verse, with om. of initial ו, is taken as the ע line of the acrostic by Gunk., Hap., and van H.; while Hpt. confidently relegates it to the margin.—**2^{1}.** הִנֵּה] Gunk. tr. to precede משמיע; so Hap.. Oort$^{Em.}$, הֵנָּה, joining with 1^{14}. Van H. הִנָּם, and tr. הנם על־ה׳ to foll. שלום.—מבשר] Hpt. om. as "scribal expansion," while van H. om. משמיע.—שלמי] Gunk. adds ירשלם as subj.; so Hap.. 𝔊^{Y} om. ש׳ נדריך.—לעבור] 𝔖 = לעבר, probably an inner-Syr. error (Seb.). Gunk. הָעֹבֵר. Hap. יַעֲבֹר.—בליעל] Has here almost the force of a proper name, as in 2 S. 23^{6} Jb. 34^{18}. 𝔖 by dissimilation gets *beli'ar;* so also in 2 Cor. 6^{15}. It is used as a proper name to designate Satan in Testimony of the Twelve Patriarchs, The Ascension of Isaiah, and Jubilees; and in Sybilline Oracles, it is applied to Nero. If compounded of בְּלִי and יַעַל, it is the only case in Heb. of a compound common noun; such formations are frequent in proper names. Other explanations are, (a) = בלי יעלה = '(from which) one comes not up,' *i. e.* the underworld; (b) = the name of Belili, the Babylonian goddess of vegetation and of the underworld, the name having been given a popular etymology in Heb.. In favour of its connection with some proper name is the later tradition which so regarded it and the difficulty of classifying it as a common noun in any formation. The analogy of לא דבר and possibly בלימה will not permit us to throw the theory of composite origin summarily out of court. In any case, it is probably a loan-word in Heb., the origin of which is no longer discoverable. 𝔊's rendering here, *εἰς παλαίωσιν*, is unique; its ordinary renderings are *ἀνόμημα*, *ἀνομία*, *ἀποστασία*, *λοιμός*, *παράνομος*, *ἁμαρτωλός*; it treats it as a proper name in Pr. 16^{27} Ju. 20^{13}, as does Θ in Ju. 19^{22}. *Cf.* Che. *EB.* 525 *f.*; *KAT.*^{3}, 464; G. F. Moore on Ju. 19^{22} in *ICC.*; H. P. Smith on 1 S. 1^{16}, in *ICC.*; Charles, *Ascension of Isaiah*, pp.

lv–lvii, 6–7.—כלה] Rd. כָּלָה, with 𝕲 *συντετέλεσται*; so We., Gunk., Hap., Now., Marti. Hpt. כֻּלָּה. כל with sf. usually foll. its vb rather than precede it as here; hence the preference for 𝕲.—נכרת] 𝕲 *ἐξῆρται*.—Gunk. obtains the ר, ש and ת lines of the acrostic from this verse—the ר line by transposing הִנֵּה, the ש line by tr. the two halves of the second line and inserting 'Jerusalem' as a subject, and the ת line by ruthlessly inserting תם before לא יוסיף. Hap. approves this, with the substitution of תחת for תם. Bick., with greater arbitrariness, om. all of 2^1 except חגי ח׳ בל׳ כ׳ נכ׳, before which he puts רִגְזִי to form the ר line. Van H. tr. בליעל כ׳ נ׳ to the end of 1^{14}, begins the ר line with רגלי, tr. הִנֵּה to precede על הה׳, and om. משמיע. By proceedings like these, any poem might be transformed into an acrostic.—**3.** שב י׳] 𝕲 *ἀπέστρεψεν κύριος*. 𝕾 *I am about to turn*. New., Gr. ישיב. The Qal is used here with the force of a Hiph. as in the idiom שוב שבות, aside from which the usage is found only in Ps. 85^5 Jb. 39^{12} Nu. 10^{36}, where the text is extremely uncertain. Hpt. secures the usual intrans. force here by om. את יהוה as a gloss (so Du.), leaving גאון י׳ as the subj.. The trans. rendering is supported by 𝕲 𝕾 𝕿.—גאון] Rd. גֶּפֶן, with Gunk., Now., Marti, van H., Kau., Kent. 𝕲 *ὕβρις*.—כגאון] Rd. כְּגֶפֶן; so Marti, Kau., Kent. Hpt., Du. וְגֶפֶן. Van H. וּגְאוֹן. Gunk. om. כג׳ י׳ as a variant of the preceding phrase; so Now., Dr..—בקקום בקקים] 𝕲 *ἐκτινάσσοντες ἐξετίναξαν*. 𝕾 *they will trample upon the tramplers*. Gunk. om. בקקום as a variant. Du. בְּקָקוּהָ ב׳.—וזמריהם] Gunk. זמריה; so Du..—If there were any reason to suppose that the acrostic was to be found in these verses, the proposal of Bick. to secure the ש line here by om. כי from before שב would be attractive; for כי is not essential to the thought and it opens one of three successive lines beginning with כי; hence, it might easily be accounted for as due to dittog.. But there is no warrant for the insertion by Bick. and van H. of תחת before כי בק׳ to form the ת line. Gunk. om. כי from before שב, but regards the resulting ש line as a later addition to the acrostic, since he has already found a ש in 2^1.

§ 4. THE FALL OF NINEVEH ($1^{11.\ 14}$ $2^{2.\ 4-14}$).

A series of five strs. portraying the destruction of Assyria's capital. **Str. I** announces Yahweh's punitive purpose and ironically urges Nineveh to her own defence ($1^{11.\ 14}$ 2^2). **Str. II** presents a vivid picture of the attack upon Nineveh (2^{4-6}). **Str. III** describes the distress within the city (2^{7-10}). **Str. IV** sets forth the helplessness of Assyria (2^{11-13}). **Str. V** in Yahweh's own words declares that the destruction will be thorough and complete (2^{14}). This is the first of the genuine oracles of Nahum.

DID not one come forth from thee devising evil against Yahweh, counselling wickedness?
Yahweh has commanded concerning thee, "There shall be sown of thy name no longer.
From the house of thy gods, I will cut off the graven and the molten image.
I will make thy grave a dishonour."
A shatterer has come up against thee: keep the rampart;
Watch the road; brace your loins; strengthen your might to the utmost.
THE shield of his warriors is reddened; the mighty men are clothed in scarlet.
They will prepare the chariots on that day; the chargers will tremble.
In the fields, the chariots rage to and fro; they run about in the open places.
Their appearance resembles torches; they dart about like lightning.
He summons his nobles; they take command of their divisions (?);
They hasten to the wall and the battering-ram (?) is set up.
THE gates of the rivers are opened and the palace melts away.
And . . ., and her maidens are moaning,
Like the voice of doves, beating upon their breasts.
And Nineveh—like a pool of water are her defenders, and as they flee,
"Stand fast, stand fast" (one cries), but no one turns back.
"Plunder silver, plunder gold; for there is no end to the supplies."
THERE is emptiness and void and waste, and a melting heart and staggering of knees.
And anguish is in all loins and the faces of all of them become livid.
Where is the den of the lions and the cave of the young lions,
Whither the lion went to enter, the lion's cub, with none to disturb;
Where the lion tore prey sufficient for his cubs and rended for his lionesses,
And filled his dens with prey and his lair with booty?
BEHOLD, I am against thee; it is the oracle of Yahweh of hosts;
And I will burn up chariots with smoke, and the sword will devour thy young lions.
And I will cut off thy booty from the land, and the voice of thy messengers will be heard no more.

Str. I is addressed to Nineveh directly, announcing to her that the fate she once purposed for Jerusalem is now to overtake her herself.—**1**^{11}. *Did not one come forth from thee who devised evil against Yahweh, who counselled wickedness?*] With a slight change of form, the last word of v. ^{10} is placed at the opening of v. ^{11}. This causes no essential change in the sense here, but relieves a serious difficulty in v. ^{10}. The reference is probably to Sennacherib's having gone forth from Nineveh to attack Jerusalem. When he fought against Israel, he was in reality fighting against Yahweh, thought Nahum. Yet Micah certainly, and Isaiah probably, thought of the Assyrians as Yahweh's agents or tools in the work of punishing sinful Israel. Some interpreters have seen here an allusion rather to Sennacherib's *departure* from Jerusalem;* while others apply the statement to the whole series of Assyrian oppressors.† But the allusion to Sennacherib is more telling, since it inevitably recalls the ill-starred fate of his expedition. The word 'evil' here denotes primarily not moral evil, but positive injury, damage.—**14.** *Yahweh has commanded regarding thee: there shall be sown of thy name no more*] *i. e.* Yahweh has decreed the total extinction of Assyria. The prophet evidently conceives of Yahweh as God of gods and King of kings; the destiny of nations is in his hands. On the basis of the masculine suffix of 𝕸, the older interpreters sought to identify the person here addressed with an Assyrian king, viz. Sennacherib‡ or Ashurbanipal,§ whose dynasty is to come to an end. But the passionate exultation of Nahum requires more for its justification than the mere cessation of a dynasty; nothing less than the fall of the nation suits the case. The figure of 'sowing' here has its natural sense, referring to the perpetuation and increase of the Assyrian people, as in Is. 40^{24} Je. 31^{27} Ho. 2^{23}. For similar threats, *cf.* Is. 14^{20} Dt. 7^{24} 29^{20} 1 S. 24^{21}. The commonly accepted change from 'sow' to 'remember' (*v. i.*) is gratuitous; the figure as in 𝕸 is much more suggestive and in keeping with the poetic feeling of Nahum, while the grammatical usage involved in the phrase is not uncommon (*v. i.*). The proposal to make this verse a promise addressed to Judah, interpreting 'sow' as meaning 'scatter' as in Zc. 10^{9}, fails to take account of the fact that the latter half of this verse is evidently a threat and cannot be harmonised with a promise in the first half.—*From the house of thy gods, I will cut off graven image and molten image*] 'House' = 'temple' or 'sanctuary,' as in phrases like 'house of Yahweh,' 'house of Rimmon' (1 K. 7^{12} Ju. 9^{4} 1 S. 5^{5} 31^{10} 2 K. 5^{18}), and is used collectively here, including all the shrines of Assyria or, at least, of Nineveh. The destruction or deportation of images and the desecration of temples was the customary procedure of the Assyrians and Babylonians toward the gods of conquered peoples (2 K. $18^{33\,\text{ff.}}$ 25^{9}; *cf.* Taylor Cylinder of Sennacherib, col. V, 59; and the letter from the Jews of Elephantine to Bagoas, line 14, which testifies to similar conduct on the part of the Persians). This was the most convincing evidence of the powerlessness of the gods thus insulted. Assyria is now to suffer in her own person the humiliation she has so often inflicted upon others. For an enumeration and description of the gods of Assyria, *v.* Morris Jastrow's *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria,* pp. 188–234.*—*I will make thy grave a dishonour*] For "dishonour," 𝔐 reads "thou art worthless"; but a charge of lightness, triviality or worthlessness seems hardly to do justice to the once mighty Assyria. Nor is the expression "make thy grave" used elsewhere as the equivalent of "put to death" or "bury thee" (*cf.* Je. 7^{32} Ez. 32^{23} 39^{11-16}). As emended, the text marks the climax of misfortune for Assyria, in that instead of being held in honour after she has ceased to live, the memory of her is to become an occasion for insult and reproach (*cf.* Is. $14^{19.\,20}$)†.—**2**^{2}. *A shatterer comes up against thee; guard the rampart*] For text, *v. i.*. 𝔐 has "a scatterer"; a slight change in the vowels yields this better word; *cf.* Je. 51^{20}. Nineveh is evidently addressed here‡ and called to defend herself against one who approaches to break down her mighty towers and walls. The prophet has some foe clearly in mind; the identification of him has varied with different interpreters.§ It is unnecessary to suppose that he had any individual leader specifically in mind; his language can easily be referred to the destroying army as a whole; nothing certain can be alleged beyond this as to his meaning. The probability, however, is that he spoke upon the verge of the final campaign of the Medes against Nineveh, if indeed it had not already been instituted; *v.* Introduction, pp. 277 *f.*. In that case, he may have intended to characterise Cyaxares as "the hammer," or "shatterer"; *cf.* the title Judas "Maccabaeus."—*Watch the road; brace the loins; strengthen might to the utmost*] Ironically, the prophet urges Nineveh to take every precaution and make the most thorough preparation for an effective resistance in the approaching siege. The call is not so much for outer preparations as for a keying up of the spirits of the besieged to the highest pitch; they must exhibit both "bodily prowess and mental intrepidity";* *cf.* Am. 2^{14} Na. 2^{11}, where a state of mind exactly the opposite of this is depicted.

---

* So *e. g.* Struensee.

† So New., Rosenm., Hi., Kl..

‡ So Pu., Hd..

§ So Ra., Mich..

---

* Or better, in the revised and enlarged German edition, Vol. I, 201–243.

† For an illustration of the sort of thing Nahum has in mind, *cf. Annals of Ashurbanipal,* VI, 70 *f.*: "The mausoleums of their kings, the earlier and later ones, who had not feared Ashur and Ishtar, my lords, but had been hostile to the kings my fathers, I destroyed and laid waste and exposed them to the sun. I took their bones to Assy.; I gave their shades no repose and deprived them of their food- and drink-offerings."

‡ Many earlier interpreters make Judah the addressee; so AE., Ki., Ra., Abar., Sanctius, Dathe, Mich., Hd..

§ Nebuchadrezzar is the choice of Jer., AE., Cal., New., Bauer, Kl., Or.; Cyril prefers Cyrus; Hd. decides upon Sennacherib; while Arbaces is selected by Mich., Cyaxares by Gre. and Mau., Phraortes by Ew., and others are satisfied with the Medo-Chaldean army, *e. g.* Eich., Jus., Theiner, Struensee, Hi., and Br..

Str. II describes the foes' impetuous attack upon the city.—**2^4.** *The shield of his warriors is reddened*] The pronoun refers to the invading foe previously personified as "the shatterer," rather than to Yahweh† or the Assyrian king.‡ The language of the verse as a whole is much better suited to the actions of the besiegers than to those of the besieged. The redness of the shields has been variously accounted for; *e. g.* as due to the fact that the shields were made of gold,§ a fact which is only hypothesis, however, and extremely unlikely at that; or to the blood that dripped from them,** which would probably be described with more precision (*cf.* Is. 9^5 63^3 Rev. 9^{17}); or to the anointing or dying of the leather facings of the shields (Is. 21^5 2 S. 1^{21});†† or, perhaps better, to the reflection of the sunshine from the reddish copper surface of the shields (1 Mac. 6^{39}; Jos. *Ant.* xiii, 12, § 5).‡‡—*The men of might are clothed in scarlet*] This seems to have been the characteristic colour of the Babylonians (Ez. 23^{14}) and Medes;§§ that of the Assyrians was blue (Ez. 23^6 $27^{23\,\text{f.}}$). Purple and reddish garments were very costly; hence an objection to this interpretation of the word arises in that such garments would scarcely be worn by an entire army. Three ways of obviating this difficulty may be considered. The possibility of various cheaper grades of goods must be reckoned with;*** the view that blood-stained garments are meant††† is not consistent with the interpretation of the passage as describing the appearance of the foe

* Dr.. † Hi.. ‡ *Contra* Cyril, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Hap., *et al.*.

§ Kl.. ** Grotius, Abar., Jrm., Hal., Hpt.. †† Hd., Dav.. ‡‡ Hi., Or..

§§ Pollux, Bk. I, 13, says: Σαράγης, Μήδων τι φόρημα, πόρφυρος, μεσόλευκος χιτών. *Cf.* the statement (cited by Dr.) from Xenophon's *Cyropædia*, VI, iv, 1, that the Persian army of the younger Cyrus "flashed with bronze and gleamed with crimson military cloaks," which they had obtained from the Medes.

*** Van H.. ††† Grotius, Abar., Jrm., Hal., Hpt..

before the battle; while there is no warrant for supposing the term "men of might" to designate only the leaders of the army as being arrayed in costly raiment[*]—the terms "warriors" and "mighty men" seem both alike to be general in scope and equivalent to "soldiers" or "fighters." The correctness of the rendering "clothed with scarlet" seems established by the parallelism with "reddened," notwithstanding the difficulty it offers, the fact that it is the only occurrence of this verb and the variant reading of 𝔊 𝔖, which, however, hardly furnishes satisfactory sense here.—*Like the flame of torches*] These words are apparently a gloss upon the rare and difficult word which precedes, viz. "clothed in scarlet."[†] This is indicated both by the difficulty of connecting them naturally with the following words and by the fact that when they are removed, the line becomes of normal length. Of the various attempts to explain them in conjunction with the following words, none can meet with general approval. They are equally burdensome when joined with the preceding words. 𝔐 is practically untranslatable.[‡] RV. "flash with steel" or "are with fire of steel" connects פלדת with an Arabic and Syriac word = 'steel,' from a similar root. But it is doubtful if this is not a loan-word in Arabic from the Persian;[§] and if of Persian origin, its currency in the Hebrew of Nahum's time is unlikely. If the reading "steel" be correct, the easiest rendering is "like fire is the steel (of the chariot)." This is not, however, to be understood as implying scythed chariots,[**] for such are not represented anywhere on Assyrian monuments, nor certainly known till the time of Cyrus, the Younger. Armoured chariots would fit the description. The war-chariots of the Assyrian king and his nobles were covered with plates of highly polished metal,[††] the flash of which in the sunlight might well be likened to fire. The chariots of the attacking Medes are, of course, referred to; but it is probable that they closely resembled those of the Assyrians.—*They will make ready the chariots on that day*] 𝔐 calls for the rendering, "the chariot on the day of its preparation," which must in some way be connected with the preceding phrase. But whatever may be said of the relationship of the two preceding words to this phrase as it is in 𝔐, certainly "on the day of its preparation" is a rather lame conclusion for a sentence that starts out with so much vigour. Moreover, the infinitive construct of the Hiphʿil stem of כּוּן is nowhere else given the intransitive or passive force involved in the rendering "preparation," whether the suffix 'its' refer to the word 'chariot' or go further back to the 'shatterer' of v.^{2}. Not only so, but if this infinitive construct be pointed as a pf., 3d pers. pl., it occupies the same place in its sentence and is in every other respect parallel to the verb of the co-ordinate clause. The difficulty involved in rendering בַּיּוֹם by "in that day" exists also in Ju. 13^{10}; in both cases, either the article must be given the strong demonstrative force which it sometimes has or, with less likelihood, הוּא must be supposed to have dropped out of the text at a very early date.*—*And the chargers will tremble*] *i. e.* the high-spirited war-horses will quiver with excitement, eager for the fray. This rendering is based upon 𝔊. 𝔐 has "cypresses" in place of "chargers"; this is usually taken in a figurative sense as indicative of lances or spears, so called because of their wooden shafts, *pars pro toto*.† Against this are the lack of any parallel instance of such usage in Hebrew and the unlikelihood of a reference to spears in the midst of a sentence otherwise wholly concerned with chariots and their equipment. The Greeks and Romans employed this figure,‡ but it is unknown to Semitic literature.—**5.** *The chariots will rage to and fro in the fields, they will rush hither and thither in the spacious places*] *Cf.* Je. 46^{9}. The words here rendered "fields" and "spacious places" are frequently applied to the streets and squares within the walls of cities; but this is not always the case (*cf.* Jb. 5^{10} 18^{17} Pr. $9^{20(?)}$ 24^{27}). Regions outside of the city seem required here by the context; the language of this verse itself more naturally characterises the conduct of those who are on the outside of the walls,* than that of those within.† The comparison with torches and lightning made in the following line is suggestive of anything rather than the terror of the defeated; it must be intended to characterise the movements of the conquering army. Hence, it can hardly be said that while a contest before the walls of the city is here represented, yet the details of the description apply to the movements of the vanquished,‡ rather than to those of the victors. Some interpreters would place the struggle in one of the suburbs of Nineveh, outside of the fortifications of the main city;§ but the "streets" and "squares" of a suburb are little better adapted to cavalry manœuvres than are those of the city itself.**—*Their appearance is like that of torches; they dart about like lightning*] The pronouns refer to the chariots of the previous verse, not to the fields and open places,†† notwithstanding the fact that the grammatical gender of the suffix in 𝔐 brings it into agreement with "open places"; *v. i.*. The armoured chariots dashing hither and thither in the blazing sunlight are suggestive of lightning flashes both by their speed and their brilliance.—**6.** *He summons his nobles; they take command of their companies* (?)] The course of thought seems to require that this verse be interpreted as applying to the invader and the forces he urges forward to the attack upon Nineveh.‡‡ Many scholars, however, have preferred to interpret it as descriptive of the king of Assyria and his army;§§ while others refer the first part of the verse to the Assyrians and the second to the invaders.*** The cause of this uncertainty is twofold; (a) the lack of any subject for יזכר in the immediate context; (b) the meaning of יכשלו. The objection to the Assyrian king as the subject is the fact that there has been no previous allusion to him here, and he could scarcely be brought upon the scene without being definitely pointed out in some way. On the other hand, the suffix of אדיריו, 'his nobles,' naturally goes back to the same antecedent as that of גבריהו, 'his warriors' (v. [4]), viz. the "shatterer" of v. [2].

---

[*] Ke., *et al.*.

[†] So Hap..

[‡] It is given up as hopeless by We., Dav., GASm., Marti, Dr., Kau..

[§] So Stei.; Lagarde, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, 75; *cf.* Nö. *ZDMG.* XXX, 769; Now..

[**] *Contra* Hi.. Jrm. (p. 167) calls attention to the fact that Xenophon in several passages of the *Cyropædia* names Cyrus as the inventor of ἅρματα ὡπλισμένα, but that the first reference to the actual use of scythe-bearing chariots is in connection with the battle of Cunaxa (401 B.C.) in *Anabasis*, I, 7, and I, 8.

[††] *V.* Kleinman's *Assyrian Sculptures in the British Museum*, Plates ci–cii, where a relief of Sennacherib shows a war-chariot with an embossed metal covering. *Cf.* Jrm., pp. 167 *f.*.

---

* *Cf.* G. F. Moore on Ju. 13^{10} in *ICC*..

† So Cal., Hi., Ste., Hd., *et al.*.

‡ *E. g. Iliad*, XIX, 387–390; *Æneid*, XI, 667; Hesiod, *Scut. Herc.* 188.

---

* So *e. g.* Hi., Hd., Or., We., Jrm., Dav., Now., Marti, Dr..

† *E. g.* Ew., Um., Kl..

‡ So Hap..

§ So Struensee, Dav., Jrm..

** *Cf.* Billerbeck's description of the approaches to Nineveh in *BAS*. III, 127–131.

†† Struensee.

‡‡ So *e. g.* Os., Sanctius, We., Hpt., Kent.

§§ So *e. g.* Jer., Cal., Mau., Um., Ke., Ew., Rosenm., Hd., Or., Dav., Jrm., Kau..

*** So *e. g.* Marti, Hal., Dr., van H..

The leader of the attacking army thus seems to be the subject of the action. The phrase יכשלו ב׳, however, presents difficulty. Its ordinary meaning, "they stumble in their going," is hardly applicable to the movements of a body of men eagerly advancing to the overthrow of a city. It more naturally applies to the defenders, overwhelmed by weariness and fear. If the text be correct, it is probable that the stumbling must be accounted for by the haste and eagerness of the advancing host. But a slight change of text enables us to render as above. The commanding officers after a council of war take charge, each of his own division of the army, and lead on the attack upon Nineveh. This rendering involves giving to הליכתם a shade of meaning not elsewhere found, viz. "company of soldiers"; but the closely allied meaning "caravan" occurs in Jb. 6^{19} and the verb הלך is used of the marching of soldiers in Ju. 1^{10} 9^{1} 1 K. $22^{6.\,15}$.—*They hasten to the wall and the protector* (?) *is set up*] The preliminary skirmishes are now over; the outposts have been driven in; the attack upon the walls of the city itself now sets in. The siege-machines are brought up and set to work to batter down the walls. The precise character of the סֹכֵךְ cannot be adequately determined, since the word occurs only here. The renderings of 𝔊 𝔙 point to some kind of a shelter employed by the besiegers in their assaults upon the walls. The corresponding verb means "intertwine," "weave," "protect," thus suggesting some sort of woven protection against the missiles of the defenders. The rendering *testudo* is in keeping with this general idea, but so far as we know such a military formation was as yet unknown. Perhaps, the covered rams used to batter down walls and gates, representations of which appear on the reliefs of Ashurnaçirpal, Sargon, Sennacherib, and other Assyrian kings,* are here meant. Those who see in this verse an account of the movements of the defenders are divided in opinion regarding the סֹכֵךְ, some considering it as some sort of device to protect the defenders of the walls from the weapons of the foe, others believing it to have been some kind of destructive engine used by the besiegers which the defenders discover already placed in position, when they rush to the walls to prepare to repel the foe of whose approach they have just heard. But it is scarcely probable that so abrupt a change as this latter view involves would lack every distinguishing mark of its existence as this does. 𝕲's reading, which places the verb "set up" in an active plural form having the same subject as the preceding "hasten," is attractive and is preferred by some.

---

* *V.* the reproductions in Layard, *Nineveh and Its Remains* (1849), II, 274, 283; Billerbeck und Jrm. *BAS.* III, 179–184.

Str. III describes the fall of the city, the rout of the defenders and the looting by the captors.—**7.** *The gates of the rivers are opened and the palace melts away*] There is no warrant for the interpretation of this language as figurative, *e. g.* the rivers represent the streets of the town along which the streams of people flow,[*] or the rivers are the streams of the onrushing enemy.[†] But even so, the precise character and location of these literal gates are open to question. Are they gates located on the banks of the streams,[‡] or the fortified bridges across the streams over which entrance is had to the city ("gates" being figurative, like the "doors" of Lebanon in Zc. 11^1),[§] or "the points in the walls where the rivers or canals enter the city,"[**] or the dams that helped to control the flood-waters of the turbulent Khusur,[††] or the sluice-gates of the moats that protected the city, or the breaches opened in the city walls by the swollen river-torrent which thus flooded the city?[‡‡] In this connection, attention has been called to the part played by the river in the fall of Nineveh according to Diodorus[§§] and the activity of Zeus according to Xenophon.[***] This last view as to the character of the 'gates' is improbable; for when Yahweh co-operates with his people against the enemy in storm and flood, as this view would involve, instead of leaving his part in the victory to be inferred, as would be the case if this interpretation were correct, the prophets always emphasise the fact of Yahweh's aid and give it a large place. Then, too, the verb 'are opened' is hardly the one to be expected if the act in question was the undermining and breaking down of the city walls by the violence of the waters. Still further, the excavations on the ancient site of Nineveh thus far have furnished no evidence that any portion of the walls was washed away by floods, though proof of the destructive activity of fire is abundant. It is impossible to decide with assurance upon any one of the remaining alternatives because the nature of Nineveh's location and defences* affords so many equally plausible explanations of the terms. Nineveh lay on the east of the Tigris, for a distance of about two and a half miles, covering an area of about 1,800 acres, or two-thirds of the area of Rome inside of the Aurelian wall. The river strikes the city at its NW. corner and then makes a great curve away from Nineveh, so that the wall of the city forms the string of the bow made by the river. It is possible, according to Commander Jones, that the original course of the Tigris closely followed the line of the city wall. The Khusur, a torrent pouring down from the mountains on the NE., cut through the city at right angles to empty into the Tigris.† A system of moats protected the city on the north and east. Water for these was furnished by the Khusur, the course of which was deflected at will by means of a great dam at its entrance into the city. Other dams, higher up on its course, aided in storing up its flood-waters against a time of need. The Tigris too was confined to its proper course by a series of dykes or dams. In addition to the great inner wall of the city with its moat and its outworks protecting its gates, there were also two outer walls on the east side, each about fifty feet in height, between which was a moat about fifty-five yards wide. This complex of rivers, dams, dykes, moats, sluices, bridges, walls and gates offers a large field for conjecture as to the precise meaning of the phrase "gates of the rivers." The most accessible quarter from which to attack the city was in the NE., across the Khusur at low water. Here special precautions were taken for the city's defence, in the making of dams, moats and canals to store the flood-waters of the stream upon which the city was dependent not only for its defence, but also for its drinking-water, that of the Tigris being said to have been undrinkable.—*And the palace melts away*] It is not necessary to suppose that this language is used literally and describes the result of the action of the rushing waters upon the foundations of the royal palace.* It is more in keeping with the usage of the word 'melt' elsewhere (*cf.* Ex. 15[15] Je. 49[23] Ez. 21[20] [15 Heb.]) to take it as descriptive of the dismay and terror that befall the inmates of the palace. Whatever or wherever the "gates of the rivers" may have been, the opening of them betokens the fall of the city.—**8a.** *And . . .; she is . . .*] The meaning of this line is hopelessly obscured. The first word presents an apparently insoluble problem. Among the various attempts to derive sense from the text as it stands, only the following may be mentioned. RV. reads, "And it is decreed;† she is uncovered, she is carried away." This leaves the real subject ambiguous, forces on the first verb a meaning 'decreed' which it nowhere else has, and also creates a new meaning for the last verb. RVm. offers the alternative, "Huzzab is uncovered, etc."; but Huzzab is an entirely unknown person and, moreover, her name is not of a formation elsewhere found in feminine proper names. Many have made the first word some sort of a designation of the Assyrian Queen,‡ who is either carried into captivity or made to ascend the funeral pyre. Others regard the language as a figurative description of the state of the Assyrian kingdom or of Nineveh herself,§ Huzzab, perhaps, being a symbolic or cryptic name for the city, like Rahab for Egypt and Sheshach for Babylon. Still others connect the first word with v. [7], rendering either, "the palace is dissolved, though firmly established,"** or "the palace is dissolved and made to flow away."†† Of the various emendations of the text (*v. i.*), the following are especially noteworthy; "and the queen is stripped naked, uncovered and made to ascend (the pyre)";‡‡

---

[*] So Jer., Hi..

[†] Rosenm., Um..

[‡] Ra., Ki., Ew., Ke., Stei., Now..

[§] Hap..

[**] Dav., Hpt..

[††] C. H. W. Johns, *EB.* 3421.

[‡‡] So Kl., Or..

[§§] II, 26, 27: ἦν δ'αὐτῷ λόγιον παραδεδομένον ἐκ προγόνων ὅτι τὴν Νίνον οὐδεὶς ἑλεῖ κατὰ κράτος ἐὰν μὴ πρότερον ὁ πόταμος τῇ πόλει γένηται πολέμιος . . . . . . συνέβη τὸν Εὐφράτην μέγαν γενόμενον κατακλύσαι τε μέρος τῆς πολεως καὶ καταβαλεῖν τὸ τεῖχος ἐπὶ σταδίους εἴκοσιν.

[***] *Anabasis*, III, IV, 12: ταύτην δε τὴν πόλιν πολιορκῶν ὁ Περσῶν βασιλεὺς οὐκ ἐδύνατο οὔτε χρόνῳ ἑλεῖν οὔτε βίᾳ. Ζεὺς δὲ βροντῃ κατέπληξε τοὺς ενοικοῦντας και οὕτως ἑάλω.

---

* *V. F. Jones, Topography of Nineveh, JRAS.* 1855, pp. 297–397; Billerbeck, *BAS.* III, 118 *f.*; C. H. W. Johns, *EB.* 3420 *ff*..

† Friederich (*Ninive's Ende u.s.w.*, p. 31) seeks to prove that the Khusur in the days of Sennacherib flowed around the city and not through it, and that the final destruction of the city was hastened by the fact that the flood-waters of the rivers carried away large sections of the city walls and inundated the town.

---

* Kl., Or., Hpt..

† Similarly Hi., Mau., Um., Ke., Pu., Strauss, Kl., Or..

‡ *E. g.* Ki., Ra., Kalinsky, Ew., We..

§ Cal., Theodoret, Cyril, Jer., Mich. Bauer, Pu., Kl., Or., Schegg, Ke..

** Hd..

†† So Ges. (*Thesaurus*), connecting with Ar. ضَبّ

‡‡ Che. *JBL.* 1896.

"brought out, a captive, deported is the king's fair consort";[*] "the goddess (Zib) is uncovered and brought to the light,"[†] Zib being the name of the planet Venus with which Ishtar, goddess of Nineveh, was identified. The star of Ishtar, however, was Dilbat, while Zib was the constellation of the Fish.[‡] Closely allied to this latter rendering in sense, though resting upon a quite different text (*v. i.*), is the last reading forthcoming, viz. "Belit (*i. e.* the consort of the god Ashur) is driven forth into captivity."[§] The probability that the goddess of Nineveh is referred to here[**] is certainly greater than that it is the queen. The latter plays no conspicuous part in Assyrian history, while the goddess occupied a very large place in the minds of the Assyrian monarchs.[††] If such were the meaning of the passage, Nahum was announcing once more as Nineveh's own fate that which she had inflicted time and again upon vanquished peoples, whose gods she had delighted in carrying away; *cf.* also Is. $46^{1\text{ f.}}$.—*And her maidens are moaning, like the sound of doves, beating upon their breasts*] If the goddess of Nineveh is spoken of in the previous clause, the "maidens" are probably the female devotees of Ishtar, the women who gave themselves up wholly to her temple service and were given the name *Kadishtu* (*i. e.* 'holy women') or *Ishtaritum* (*i. e.* 'dedicated to Ishtar').[‡‡] If the reference be to the queen, the 'maidens' are, of course, her personal attendants and 'ladies in waiting.' Those interpreting the reference as to Nineveh herself make the 'maidens' to be either the outlying towns and villages dependent upon Nineveh (*cf.* Ez. 16^{46}),[§§] or the inhabitants of the capital.[***] But there is no parallel for the representation of citizens as 'maidens' of a city; the common usage as to such figures of speech is the designation 'sons' or 'daughters' (*cf.* Ju. 21^{21} Ct. 2^{7} Is. 3^{16} 51^{18} Je. 49^{3} La. 4^{2}). The women beat their breasts as timbrels or cymbals (Ps. 68^{26}), thereby giving physical outlet to their overwhelming grief; *cf.* Lk. 18^{13} 23^{48}. The cooing plaint of the dove is used to suggest the grief of mourning also in Is. 33^{14} 59^{11} Ez. 7^{16}.*—**9.** *And Nineveh—like a pool of water are her defenders*] 𝕸 is here untranslatable. RV. renders, "But Nineveh hath been from of old (*cf.* 𝕿) like a pool of water," offering as a marginal variant, "But Nineveh hath been, from the days that she hath been, like a pool of water."† But neither "from of old" nor "from the days that she hath been" could have been expressed by such Hebrew as 𝕸 offers. Another rendering, which follows 𝕲 𝖁, is "Nineveh is like a pool of water, her waters, etc.";‡ but this requires a change of text and robs the comparison of all force. On the basis of these and similar renderings, the point of the figure has been for the most part found in the fact that Nineveh was overflowing with population even as a pool is filled with waters.§ Calvin, however, saw a reference here to Nineveh's state of quietness, unbroken for generations even as the calm surface of a pool; while others have declared it to be an announcement of the inundation of Nineveh caused by the rising river and consequent bursting of the dams.** Another method of treatment for the difficult words of 𝕸 is to omit them as a corrupt repetition of the context;†† but this leaves the line too short and deprives the following "they" of any antecedent, thus necessitating the hypothesis that a part of the original line has been lost at this point.‡‡ The emendation here proposed obviates these difficulties and furnishes a good sense for the line as a whole. For the use of the word "peoples" as equivalent to "defenders," *cf.* $3^{12\text{ f. }18}$ Is. 36^{11} Nu. 20^{20} 21^{23}. The point of the comparison, with this text, is found in the rapidity with which the defenders of Nineveh disappear just at the time of greatest need. Just as the artificial ponds and moats, having so much to do with Nineveh's defences, dry up when the dams are broken through and leave the city open to the invader, so the defenders on the inside fly at the approach of danger.—*And as they flee,* (*one cries*) "*Stand fast, stand fast!*" *but none turns back*] No efforts to rally the fugitives are successful; they are panic-stricken and heed not the commands of their officers (Je. 46^5 48^{39}).—**10.** *Make spoil of silver; make spoil of*

---

[*] Hpt..

[†] Van H..

[‡] Kügler, *Sternkunde*, I, 30.

[§] Gry, *RB.* VII.

[**] Abar. and Geb. endeavoured to secure this sense on the basis of 𝔐.

[††] *Cf.* Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, 202–206.

[‡‡] *Cf. ibid.*, 660.

[§§] So Jer., Pu., Kl.. Or., *et al.*.

[***] Ke

---

* Hpt. calls attention to the use of the same figure in both Assy. and Ar..

† So Dav..

‡ So Hap. *et al.*.

§ So *e. g.* Tarnovius, Hesselberg, Ew., Hd., Ke., Or..

** So *e. g.* Kl..

†† So We. *et al.*

‡‡ So We., No..

gold] The prophet now rhetorically addresses the pursuing foe, who are hard on the heels of the fleeing Ninevites, and urges them on to their rich plunder.—*For there is no end to the stores*] Literally, "to that which is prepared." The wealth of Nineveh is unlimited. She has heaped up ill-gotten gains, the product of the plunder of her victims (*cf.* 3^1); now she herself must endure plunder. The allusions to the wealth of Nineveh in the Assyrian inscriptions are numerous. The rich booty acquired in the many campaigns, together with the enormous tribute levied upon the subject peoples which was constantly pouring into the treasury of the king, must have filled the capital city with riches to overflowing.*—*An abundance of all sorts of precious articles*] This is apparently a gloss explaining the preceding word תכונה, 'preparation.' The phrase is wholly unrelated grammatically to its context and superfluous also in the strophic form. Some attempt to create a connection by supplying some words, such as "and take ye" or "and spoil ye," at the beginning of the phrase.† For the word "abundance" or "riches" *cf.* Is. 22^{24} 61^6 66^{12} Ps. 49^{16}. The rendering "articles" is better here than "vessels." It is a general term covering a wide range, like the English "things" (*cf.* Je. 46^{19} Lv. 15^4 Dt. 22^5). The same phrase occurs in Ho. 13^{15}.

Str. IV emphasises the panic that befalls the inhabitants of the city that once preyed upon the entire world.—**11.** *There is emptiness and void and waste*] *Cf.* Is. 24^1. The Hebrew yields an assonance here that cannot be carried over into English.‡ For a similar use of paronomasia, *cf.* Zp. 1^{15} Is. 22^5 29^2. Some would make the fact that each of the second and third Hebrew nouns increases a syllable in length over its predecessor signify a corresponding increase in the intensity of the thought.* But this is somewhat fanciful. For a similar multiplication of synonyms, *cf.* Je. 48^{43} Jo. 2^{2} Jb. 10^{22}. Ruin and desolation have befallen the once proud mistress of the world.—*And a melting heart and trembling knees*] *Cf.* Jos. 7^{5} Is. 13^{7} 35^{3} Jb. 4^{4}. The description passes now from the general desolation throughout the city to the state of mind of the citizens themselves. A similar picture of the consternation of Belshazzar occurs in Dn. 5^{6}.—*And anguish in all loins*] The figure is derived from the agonies of women in child-birth; *cf.* Is. 21^{3}. The loins are regarded as pre-eminently the seat of strength (Jb. 40^{16} Pr. 31^{17}), but the very citadel of strength is now assaulted by weakness and pain; *cf.* Ps. 69^{23} Dn. 5^{6}.—*And the faces of all of them become livid*] *Cf.* Jo. 2^{6} Je. 30^{6}. The literal meaning of the last two words is probably "gather redness." This has been taken as meaning "become flushed" † and, in view of Is. 13^{8}, this may be the right view. But fear usually produces the contrary effect. Hence others, with more likelihood, conceive of the blood as all withdrawn from the face, thus leaving it of an ashy paleness; *cf.* Jo. 2^{10} 3^{15}.‡ The Versions, with a slightly different reading, think of the blackening of the face. There is not the slightest ground for eliminating this clause as a misplaced gloss on "clothed in scarlet" in 2^{4};§ it is needed here to complete the balance of thought and give the finishing touch to the picture of despair.—**12.** *Where is the den of the lions and the cave of the young lions*] By this rhetorical question, the prophet makes it clear that he anticipates a destruction of Nineveh so complete that not even a vestige will remain to mark its site. To represent Nineveh as a lion's den does not imply that the prophet regarded her rulers as having degenerated to the level of ferocious wild beasts,** but rather suggests the supreme place of power to which Assyria had arisen in the oriental world. The lion was the favourite animal for artistic and decorative purposes in Assyria; hence the figure is peculiarly fitting. Billerbeck†† sees here an allusion to zoological gardens connected with the royal palace. But, even if the royal parks were zoological gardens, which is very doubtful, this view yields a far less forceful sense. A figurative use of the terms is, in any case, much the more likely, because of the frequency with which enemies of Israel are represented as lions in the OT.; *cf.* Je. 4^{7} 49^{19} 50^{17} Ez. 19^{2} Zp. 3^{3} Ps. 35^{17}. 𝔐 offers a different text for the second half of the question, viz. "and a feeding-place is it for the young lions"; but the word "feeding-place" everywhere else means a "grazing-ground" and is thus wholly inappropriate as a name for a lion's feeding-place. This fact, together with the requirements of the parallelism, makes it advisable to transpose one letter, thus securing the word "cave"; *v. i.*.—*Whither the lion went to enter, the lion's cub, with none to terrify*] 𝔐 reads, "Whither the lion, the lioness went, the cub of the lion, with, etc.." The rough, asyndetic structure of this sentence, coupled with the doubt whether לביא = 'lioness' or is only a variant of אריה = 'lion,' leads most interpreters to follow 𝔊, as here. This is certainly an improvement upon 𝔐; but yet, the suspicion arises that לביא may be only a marginal note that has crept into the text. The expression "went to enter" is rather weak and the first half of the line is too long by one beat as compared with the second half and with the other lines of the context. Dropping לביא, the line reads smoothly, "Whither went the lion, the lion's cub, with, etc.." Another proposed reading (*v. i.*), viz. "whither the lion went to bring in, the lion's cub, with, etc.," yields an awkward arrangement and an unsatisfactory sense. —**13.** *Where the lion tore prey sufficient for his cubs and rended for his lionesses*] The booty of war was brought back to Nineveh and apportioned among the palaces and the temples. The lion here represents the king of Assyria, and the cubs his nobles.—*And filled his lairs with prey and his dens with booty*] The enormous spoils of many campaigns must have rendered Nineveh one of the wealthiest cities in the world. Under this figure, the prophet has presented in vivid and effective fashion a picture of the ferocity and rapacity which characterised the Assyrian conqueror in his treatment of defeated peoples. The royal inscriptions abound with facts warranting the impression here produced.

---

* *E. g.* Tiglath-pileser I after a campaign in Asia Minor says, "Herds of fine chargers, swift mules and the cattle of their pastures, I brought home in countless numbers. . . . I imposed on them as a tribute 1,200 horses and 2,000 head of cattle." Shalmaneser II says of the king of Patina, "3 talents of gold, 100 talents of silver, 300 talents of copper, 300 talents of iron, 1,000 vessels of copper, 1,000 pieces of variegated cloth, linen, his daughter with her large dowry, 20 talents of purple cloth, 500 oxen, 5,000 sheep, I received from him. One talent of silver, two talents of purple cloth, . . . hundred beams of cedar as tribute, I laid on him. Yearly in my city Asshur I received it." Ashurbanipal, in particular, gives long lists of the almost countless spoil of Thebes and Susa, with which he filled Nineveh (*v.* his Annals).

† So Marti, Now.^{K}, Hpt..

‡ It is fairly well represented by the German, *Leerung und Entleerung und Verheerung* (Or.).

---

* So Tarnovius, Hd..

† So Hap., Marti, Kau., Kent.

‡ So *e. g.* AE., Cal., Rosenm., Dav., Hal., Dr..

§ *Contra* Hpt..

** Cal..

†† *BAS.* III.

Str. V announces the fact that Yahweh has decreed the downfall of Nineveh and the complete destruction of all her wealth and her munitions of war.—**14.** *Behold, I am against thee, it is the oracle of Yahweh of hosts*] A common way in Jeremiah and Ezekiel of announcing a punishment from Yahweh; *e. g.* Je. 21^{13} $23^{30\text{ ff.}}$ 50^{31} 51^{25} Ez. 5^{8} $13^{8.\ 20}$ 21^{3} 28^{22}. The hosts of Assyria are powerless when confronted by the hosts of Yahweh. Certain and total ruin awaits her.—*And I shall burn up thy lair in smoke and the sword will devour thy young lions*] *Cf.* Ps. 37^{20}. Fire and sword are the agents chosen to execute Yahweh's will. 𝔐 has "her chariot" for "thy lair"; but this does not suit the figure of the lion which continues here, as is clear from the latter part of the line; while 𝔊 𝔖 reflect a different text from 𝔐 and open the door for emendations.—*And I shall cut off thy prey from the land*] The prey referred to must be the booty already in Assyria's possession; a threat to destroy the weak and defenceless nations that have hitherto been her prey would be wholly out of keeping with the spirit of the passage.—*And the voice of thy messengers will be heard no more*] The 'messengers' are the emissaries sent forth from Nineveh to exact tribute or compel submission. It is not unlikely that the memory of the insulting demand of the Rabshakeh in Hezekiah's time lies behind these words; *cf.* 2 K. $18^{17.\ 19}$ $19^{9.\ 23}$ Is. 33^{18}.

The metre of this section is rough and irregular. Hexameters are more frequent than any other measure; tetrameters are also common; while a few pentameters appear. Uniformity of metre in the successive lines can be attained only by taking unwarranted liberties with the text. The lines are easily grouped into five logical units, constituting strs. of six lines each, except in the case of the closing str., which is reduced to three lines.

This section forms the first part of the genuine prophecy of Nahum as it has been transmitted. It is not probable, however, that this constituted the original beginning of the prophecy (*contra* Arn.). V. [11] is too abrupt to have been the opening of Nahum's discourse; some direct mention of Assyria or Nineveh must have preceded it and furnished the antecedent of the pronoun "thee." The preceding acrostic has probably displaced the original beginning; so Bu. *EB.* 3261; Dr.; Kau.; *contra* Or.. The first str. as organised above may contain fragments of this lost section of the prophecy; it seems hardly probable that these six lines originally belonged so closely together as to have fallen within the limits of a single str..

The section has received no important additions aside from the prefixed acrostic already considered and the verses treated in § 3. A few slight glosses are discoverable, but these do not affect the close unity of the passage and the clear and logical progress of the thought. The style is elevated and vigorous. The imaginative and pictorial qualities of the description serve to bring the scene actually before our eyes. The participants in the struggle rush to and fro in our presence and we see the anguish written upon the faces of the vanquished.

Of the various attempts made to incorporate 1$^{11.\ 14}$ 2^{2} in the acrostic which forms the first part of ch. 1, none can command assent. Gunk. (1893) obtained his פ, צ and ק lines from 1^{14}, viz.

פסל ומסכה אשמיד מבית אלהיך אכרית
צוה עליך י׳ לא יזכר בשמך עוד
קרוב [יום י׳] קל [מהרה מאד]

He also secured the מ line in part from v. ^{11} by emendation and transposition, viz.

מה תחשבון על י׳ רעה (11b) תיעצו בליעל (12a) על משלמים (9a).

Bick accepted the צ line, but proposed the following ק line, made up from 1$^{14c.\ d}$ by emendation, transposition and omission; viz.

קִבְרֵךְ אשים קִיקָלוֹת אכרית פסל ומסכה

Hap. agreed essentially with Bick., viz.

צוה עליה י׳ לא יזכר בשמם עוד
קברים אשים כקלון אכרית פסל ומסכה

Van H. uses v. ^{11} for the מ line, which others find in v. ^{9}, offers v. $^{14c.\ d}$ in a new arrangement for the פ line, and creates the ק line out of a combination of 1^{14e} and 2^{1}; viz.

11 ממך יצא חֹשֵׁב רע וְיֹעֵץ עָלַי בליעל
14$^{d.\ e}$ פסל מקרבך אכרית מבית אלהיך מסכה
14$^{e.}$ 2$^{1f.}$ קִבְרֵךְ אשים קִיקָלוֹן בליעל כלו נכרת

Now., who in his first ed. sought to complete the acrostic, in the 2d. ed. (1903) abandoned the attempt to go further than the כ line in v. ^{8} and rightly said of v. ^{11} that it offered insuperable difficulties to the supposition of an acrostic structure. The arbitrary character of the many changes involved in each of the efforts to use these verses for the completion of the acrostic makes it necessary to agree with the opinion of the majority of scholars that while these attempts do credit to the ingenuity of their authors, they cannot be regarded as demonstrating the presence of an acrostic structure in these verses; so *e. g.* Now., Marti, Dr., Hpt., Stk., Kau., Du..

1^{11}. ממך] Du. מִמֵּךְ. Gunk. (*Schöpfung*, 102), מנך = 'thy appointed time.'—יצא] 𝔊 𝔙 = יֵצֵא; so Gr..—חשב] 𝔊 *λογισμός*.—יעץ] 𝔙 *mente pertractans*.—בליעל] Gunk. adds עַל מְשַׁלְמִים, based upon אִם שׁ׳ of 1^{12}. No certain derivation for ב׳ is yet known; *v.* on 2^{1}.—**14.** Rd. all sf. in verse as fem. with 𝔖; so Gr., Marti, Now.^{K}, Stk., *et al.*.—וצוה] Om. conj.

with We., Gunk., Hap., Now., Dr., Du..—עליך] Hap. עליהם.—יזרע משמך] מ׳ is the grammatical subj. of יז׳, the prep. being used in the partitive sense. Gr. יִזָּרֵה מֵעַמֵּךְ (?). Hap. יזכר בשמם. Now. יִזָּכֵר שמם. Marti, יזכר שִׁמֵּךְ; so Now.^{K}, Kau., Stk., Kent. Du. יִזָּרַע מ׳. Hpt. יִזָּרֶה שלמיך.—מבית אלהיך] 𝔖 joins with preceding vb. and seems to read מ as בְּ. Marti, מִבָּתֵּי א׳. Now. and Hap. om. as gloss. Du. מב׳ אביך (?).—אשים] 𝔖 = ואשימנו. Gr. אסיר. Gunk. and Hap. אשמיר. Oort$^{Em.}$ אשא.—קברך] Gr. מִקִּרְבֵּךְ; *cf.* Oort, מִקִּרְבְּךָ. Hap. קברם.—כי קלות] Rd. קָלוֹן and om. כי as due to dittog. of preceding כ, with We.; so Marti, Dr., Now.^{K}, Hpt., Stk., Kau.; *cf.* Hap. כְּקָלוֹן. This gives אשים two acc., a common usage with this vb. being thus exchanged for the difficult idiom of 𝔐. 𝔊 *ὅτι ταχεῖς*; similarly 𝔖 𝔗. Gr. נִכְלַמְתְּ. Bick. קיקלות, an Aram. word = 'dungheaps'; so Gunk. (*Schöpfung*, 103). Rub. כי עלה, to be tr. to beginning of 2^{2}. Arn. כְּקֵלוֹת = *crepitus ventris.* Now.(?) and van H. קִיקָלוֹן.—Some would place אשים וגו׳ immediately after v. ^{14a} (*e. g.* Marti, Hpt., Stk.) mtr. cs. and יועץ בליעל of v. ^{11b} after יצא in v. ^{11a}. But transpositions of this sort in a context as broken as $1^{11.\ 14}$ 2^{2} seem hardly worth while. Certainly, the sense is not improved by either change.—**2**^{2}. מפיץ] Rd. מֵפֵץ, with Mich. (*Or. Bibl.* XX, 189); so We., Jrm., Dav., Now., Rub., GASm., Marti, Dr., Hpt., Stk., Kent, Kau., Du.. 𝔊 *ἐμφυσῶν.* 𝔖 ܡܦܨܢ, corrected by Seb. to ܡܦܨܝܢ. Hap. הַפֹּצֶה = 'the rescuer.'—על] Gr. מעל.—פניך] Ew. פָּנֶיךָ; so Hi., Buhl, Dav., Now., Du.. Perles, פְּנַיִךְ. Rub. פָּנֶיהָ. 𝔊^{Y}, HP. 22, 51, 95, 185, פניו.—נצור מצורה] Inf. abs. as imv. Ges.$^{\S\ 133\ bb}$. 𝔊 *ἐξαιρούμενος* (𝔊^{Y} + *σε*) *ἐκ θλίψεως* = נֹצֵר מִצָּרָה; so Hap.. 𝔊 does not necessarily indicate the lack of ו in the original of מצורה, for it also took no account of ו in נצור, which there is no reason to change. 𝔙 *qui custodiat obsidionem.* Some Heb. mss. נ׳ נצורה; others, נ׳ מצודה. Gr. וְצָר מצ׳. Oort$^{Em.}$ נ׳ מְצוּרָה. We. נְצֹר מַצָּרָה; so Now., GASm.. Rub. נְצוּר מַצָּרָה; so Marti, Now.^{K}, Stk., Kau., Du.. Hpt. נ׳ מְצוּרָה. But 𝔐's מ׳ is a well-established word and there is nothing inherently inconsistent in the idiom נצר מ׳; words of similar sound but of different roots are not infrequently associated in Heb. for the sake of the assonance.—**4.** מגן] A smaller shield than the צִנָּה which protected the whole body (*cf.* 1 K. $10^{16.\ 17}$). Both types may be seen in *BAS.* III, 169, 174–6, 185; *cf.* Benzinger, *Heb. Archäologie*,^{2} 300. 𝔊 pl.. Rub. מָגְנוּ, 'they mocked.'—גִּבֹּרֵיהוּ] Normally גִּבֹּרָיו; *cf.* Ges.$^{\S\ 91\ l}$. 𝔊 *δυναστείας αὐτῶν.* 𝔙 *fortium ejus.* 𝔖 = גבוריהם; so Gr., Hap.. Stk. גִּבֹּרִים.—מאדם] With ◌ָ for ◌ֳ, as in שֳׁדֵּדָה, 3^{7}; 𝔊 *ἐξ ἀνθρώπων* = מֵאָדָם; so Rub., Hap.(?). 𝔙 *ignitus.* Hap. מְדָם.—מתלעים] *ἅπ.*; a denominative from תֹּלָע, 'scarlet.' 𝔊 *ἐμπαίζοντας* = מִתְעַלְּלִים (*cf.* Ex. 10^{2} Nu. 22^{29} Jd. 19^{25} 1 K. 6^{6} 31^{4} 1 Ch. 10^{4} Is. 3^{4} 66^{4}; *v.* Marg. *JAOS.* XXX, 306); so 𝔖, Rub.. 𝔊 has been derived less well from לעה (so Vol., We., Now., *et al.*)

and לִבַּב (Hpt.). Hap. מְהָלְעִים or נגעל (?).—באש] Rd., with some Heb. mss., כאש; so Houb., Mich., Gr., We., Jrm., Or., Oort, Now., GASm., Hap., Marti, Gressmann (*Esch.* 177), Hpt., Kau. (?), Kent, Du.. Rub. באיש.—פְּלָדוֹת] Being in the abs., the only possible treatments of 𝔐 are (1) the connection of באש פ׳ with מהלעים as a modifier, which makes too long a line; (2) the disposal of it as the predicate of the foll. group of words, in which case the כ is handled with great difficulty. The best solution is to read לַפִּידוֹת, with 𝔖; so Ra., Dru., Cal., New., Hap., Hal., Nestle (*ZAW.* XXIX, 154), Gressmann (*l. c.*), Kau.. Against this may be urged the fact that elsewhere ל׳ makes its pl. in ־ִים; but examples of nouns making the pl. in both ways are not wanting; *e. g.* מְארוֹת, but מְאוֹרֵי (Ez. 32^8); שָׁנִים and שָׁנוֹת; אֲלֻמִּים and אלמות; אֵימִים and אימות; Ges.$^{\S\, 87q}$. 𝔊 *αἱ ἡνίαι*, 'the reins'; *cf.* 𝔙 *habenae*, joining it with foll. הרכב. Gre. פלכות, 'axles.' Rub. פרצות, 'terror.' Che. (*EB.* 2174), חֲלֻפֹּת, 'metal plates' (*cf.* Assy. *ḫalluptu*, 'covering'). Hpt. לְפֶּרֶת, a word not elsewhere found. Du. פְּתִחוֹת.—בְּיוֹם] Rd. בַּיּוֹם; for demonstrative force of art., *cf.* Ges.$^{\S\, 126a}$.—הֲכִינוֹ] Rd. הֱכִינוּ. Gr. הכינם.—והברשים] Rd. והפרשים = 𝔊 *καὶ οἱ ἱππεῖς*; so 𝔖 and Mich., Gre., New., Gr., We., Dav. (?), Jrm., Rub., GASm., Now., Hap., Hal., Marti., Hpt., Dr., van H., Stk., Kau., Kent, Du.. 𝔙 *et agitatores.*—הרעלו] ἅπ.. Nouns formed from this √ are found in Is. 3^{19} $51^{17.\,22}$ Zc. 12^2 Ps. 60^5; all exhibit some form of the idea 'quiver,' 'tremble.' Hpt. renders, "they are frenzied, *i. e.* they run amuck, run like mad," connecting it with Ar. *ráʿila*, 'to be stupid,' 'doltish'; but stupidity is scarcely a suitable predicate of horses rushing to the charge, and horses 'running amuck' are more characteristic of a panic-stricken retreat. Furthermore, the noun-formations are more easily connected with the root-idea of 'trembling.' Van H. notes that in Ar. *raʿlat* and *raʿîl* = "a troop of horses"; but the usage of these words suggests nothing of trembling or prancing, since they indicate a group of horses (or, indeed, cows!) going in single file, or the leader of such a line, the root-idea seeming to be 'project' or 'thrust.' This latter sense would accord well with 𝔐, if the interpretation of ב׳ as 'spears' could be rendered probable. 𝔊 *θορυβηθήσονται.* 𝔙 *consopiti sunt.* 𝔖 מתבלהין. Rub. ירעלו. Gr., Du. הִרְעִימוּ.

Billerbeck and Jrm. insert 3^{12-15} here; but the introduction of the 2d pers. here is abrupt, while it is wholly in place after 3^{11}; and the interruption of the vivid description of the attack is unwelcome. Kl. also would make a sharp distinction between 2^4 and 2^5, by treating the latter as bringing the conduct of the besieged into sharp contrast with that of the besiegers described in v. ^{4}. But the language of v. ^{5} seems to require its application to the attacking party (*v. s.*) rather than to the attacked.

5. יתהוללו] 𝔊 *καὶ συγχυθήσονται.* 𝔖 *they glory* = יִתְהַלְּלוּ; so some Heb. mss..—ישתקשקון] 𝔊 *καὶ συμπλακήσονται.* 𝔖 *and they boast.*—ברחבות] 𝔖 includes this in the rendering of בחוצות. Struensee, Dav. and Jrm. interpret ר׳ as = רחבות עיר (Gn. 10^{11}), which in turn is to be identified with the Assy. *ribit Ninâ.* But neither of these propositions is proven and the term ר׳ alone seems altogether too indefinite as a designation of the *ribit Ninâ.* This latter phrase is used by Esarhaddon (I 53, 54) and Sargon (Cylinder, 44) with the general signification "precincts of Nineveh" and does not indicate a special outpost or fort. It is a general term and used also of other cities than Nineveh; *e. g.* Dur-ilu. Hence any attempt to locate it, either NE. (Dl. *Paradies*, 260 *f.*; Jrm.) or W. (Billerbeck) of Nineveh, or to identify it with any specific suburb of Nineveh, whether Mosul (Billerbeck) or Khorsabad (Johns, *EB.* 4029), seems fruitless.—מראיהן] Rd. מראיהם, with Houb., Gre., Kre., New., We., Now., BDB., Marti, van H., Stk., Kau., Du.; the antecedent רכב is masc. everywhere else.—ירוצצו] ἅπ. in Pôlel. Hpt. rightly rejects the usual rendering 'run hither and thither' in favour of 'run fast,' which is a better interpretation of the intensive form. Gr. ירוצו. Hal. ינוצצו.—**6.** יזכר] The meaning 'summon,' 'call for' is found for this vb. only here and probably in Jb. 14^{13}; but some such sense seems demanded by this context. The lack of any indication as to the identity of the subj. adds to the difficulty and awakens a suspicion that the text is in error. To om. יז׳ with Marti as an insertion, or with Hpt. as a misplaced gloss on יזרע (1^{14}), leaves the line too short. None of the emendations offered can be considered satisfactory. 𝔊 *καὶ μνησθήσονται.* 𝔖 *are seized.* Gr. יִשָּׁכְרוּ. Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$ ימהרו. Rub. וְזֻכֶּיהָ = 'and thy infantry' (*cf.* Assy. *zu-ku*). Van H. יזכרו. Hap. יִזָּכֵר בִּשְׁמָמָם. Du. יִדְהֲרוּ, as in 3^{2}.—אדיריו] 𝔊 𝔗 = 3 pl. sf.; so Rub., Hap.. 𝔙 *fortium suorum* = אביריו. Van H. אדיריה.—יכשלו בהליכתם] Rd. ימשלו ב׳. For interchange of מ and כ, *v.* note on Mi. 1^{2}. The Kt. הליכותם goes better with מ׳ than the sg. of Qr.. For the interpretation of this reading, *v. s.*. 𝔊 *καὶ φεύξονται ἡμέρας καὶ ἀσθενήσουσιν ἐν τῇ πορίᾳ αὐτῶν.* 𝔖^{H} places *καὶ φ΄ ἡ΄* under obelus, but in marg. declares "this obelus was not present in the Hexapla." The plus of 𝔊 is probably due to a reader who sought to make it clear that the verse applied to the actions of the besieged. There is no reason for regarding it as representing an original element in the text; the line is complete without it. Reinke treats it as a variant rendering of ימהרו חומתה. Gr. foll. 𝔊, inserts ונסו ביום; Rub. ינוסו ביום; and van H. מְנוּסָה יוֹמָם. Hap. יכ׳ בְּיוֹם ה׳. Kent, יִשְׁפְּילוּ בה׳. Du. יְאַשְּׁרוּ בה׳.—חוֹמָתָהּ] Rd. חוֹמָתָה, with some Heb. mss. 𝔖 𝔗 and Now., Hap., Du.. The lack of any specific antecedent for the sf. makes the ה directive much more suitable. 𝔊 *ἐπὶ τὰ τείχη αὐτῆς.*—והכן] 𝔊 *καὶ ἑτοιμάσουσιν*; so 𝔖 𝔗; *i. e.* וְהֵכִינוּ; so Rub., Hap.; *cf.* Kent הֵכִינוּ. Hal. וְהֵכוּ.—הסכך] 𝔊 *τάς προφυλακὰς αὐτῶν.* 𝔙 *umbraculum.* Rub. הַסְּכִּים; *cf.* Assy. *sukkê*, used of the bed of a canal.—**7.** שערי הנהרות] Sennacherib's Bavian Ins., l. 30, says, *bâb nâri . . . u narpasu ana ramanišu ippitima* = "the river-gate . . . and the *narpasu* opened of itself." This *bâb nâri* is generally taken as a sluice-gate through which the river waters were let into a canal; *v.* Meissner und Rost, *Bauinschriften Sanheribs* (1893), 84; Muss-Arnolt, *Assy. Dictionary; BAS.* III, 126. Possibly, as Hpt. suggests, the pl. נהרות is due to the influence of the preceding pl. שערי, and the only river in the speaker's mind was the Khusur. 𝔊 for נ׳ has *τῶν πόλεων*, probably due to error; *cf.* $𝔊^{\aleph *}$ *τῶν ποταμῶν.* 𝔖 has *of Judah;* but ܕܝܗܘܕܐ is probably an inner Syr. corruption of ܕܢܗܖ̈ܐ (so Seb.).—היכל] Ordinarily = 'temple'; but here and in such contexts as 1 K. 21^1 Ps. $45^{9.16}$ evidently the exact equivalent of its Assy. prototype *ekallu*, the usual meaning of which is 'palace.'—נמוג] 𝔊 *διέπεσεν.* 𝔙 *ad solum dirutum.* 𝔖 *is shaken.*—8. הֻצַּב] As Hoph. from נצב, this would naturally mean, "is placed in position," "established"; *cf.* Gn. 28^{12}. A somewhat similar sense would attach to it if derived from יצב. The only other vb. from which it might come, viz. צבב, is not known in Heb., nor does the Ar. ضبّ, 'cleave to the ground,' or the Heb. noun צב, 'lizard,' suggest any suitable sense. 𝔊 *καὶ ἡ ὑπόστασις.* 𝔖 *and she raised up.* 𝔙 *et miles.* 𝔗 *and the queen who sat furthering the captivities went forth*, which represents the first three words of 𝔐. Hi. הַצָּב, 'the lizard.' New. ומצב, 'and the fortress,' to be joined to v. ^{7}. Gr. וְהַצָּבָא. Vol. מַצָּב, or מַצָּבָה, 'foundation'; so Hap.. GASm. הַצְּבִי, 'the beauty.' Rub. (*PSBA*. XX, 174 *f.*) makes צב a name parallel to היכל (v. ^{7}) and joins with v. ^{7}. Che. (*JBL.* 1896, p. 198) וְחֻשְּׂפָה מַלְכָּה, 'and the queen is stripped naked.' Bu. (*EB.* 3262) adds שֵׁגָל, 'queen.' Marti substitutes וְהַשֵּׁגָל for והצב. Hpt. וְהֻצְּאָה; so Du.; *cf.* Gry (*RB.* VII, 398–403) הוצאה.—גלתה] 𝔖 *her horsemen.* 𝔙 *captivus.* Rub. derives from Assy. *galatu* and renders 'is frightened.' Hpt. הָגְלָתָה. Gry (*l. c.*) בְּגָלוּת. Du. גֻּלְּתָה.—העלתה] 𝔊 *καὶ αὕτη ἀνέβαινεν.* 𝔙 *abductus est.* 𝔖 *and she went up.* Hap. וְהעלתה. Gr. היא עלתה. Hpt. הֻעֲלָתָה. Gry (*l. c.*), הַבַּעֲלָה. Rub. (*The Academy*, March, 1896; *PSBA*. XX, 175), והעתלה (so Du.); *cf.* Assy. *etellu* (fem. *etellitu*), 'great,' 'exalted' and the Heb. queen Athaliah (עתליה). This is attractive as furnishing a suitable epithet for the goddess or queen presumably indicated by the first word of the verse.—מנהגות] 𝔊 *ἤγοντο*; hence Gr. מנהמות; so *CB.*, Hal.. Hap. נָהֲגוּ מֵהֹגִיּוֹת. Marti adds, הֹגוֹת; so Now.^{K} (?), Gry (*l. c.*). מנ׳ is *ἅπ.*, but well known in Syr. and Ar.; emendations seem gratuitous.—מתפפות] *ἅπ.* in Pô'el; Qal act. prtc. in Ps. 68^{26} and impf. in 1 S. 21^{14} 𝔊. Probably a denominative from תֹּף, 'cymbal.' 𝔊 *φθεγγόμεναι*, perhaps = מְצַפְצְפוֹת; so Sta., Now., Hap.. Du. חפפות, מ being due to dittog..—לִבְבֵהֶן] After the analogy of לְבָבָם, we should expect לְבָבָן (so Hi., Sta. § 353 a, Hap., Marti, Now.^{K}, Du.); yet this is the normal pl. form (defectively written) before the grave sf. and the pl. is called for here by the pl. subj. (so Kö. II, 78; Hpt.). The solitary occurrence of the pl. form לבבות in 1 Ch. 28^9 is insufficient to require a change in the form here.

Gr. לִבֵּיהֶן; so Gry (*l. c.*); but *cf.* לִבְהֶן, Ez. 13^{17}.—**9.** ונינוה] De R. 545, ונצבת, which Rub. believes to be a misplaced variant of והצב (v. ^{8}); *cf.* Ps. 45^{10}. Rub. also adds היתה, foll. 𝔊^{A} *ἦν*.—מימי היא] Rd. עַמֶּיהָ, 'her defenders' (*v. s.*). 𝔐 offers an unparalleled construction; one common rendering of it, "from of old," is regularly represented by מֵעוֹלָם; another "from the day that she was," would naturally be מִיָּמֶיהָ; while "her waters" would be מֵימֶיהָ; *cf.* 𝔊 *τὰ ὕδατα αὐτῆς*. 𝔊^{A} *τείχη ὕδατα αὐτῆς* = חומת מימיה. 𝔖 *and among waters is she.* 𝔙 *aquae ejus.* 𝔗 *is from days of old.* Houb. מימיה יהמוה; so Hpt. who includes והמה of 𝔐 in the basis of this reading. Gr. om. מימי as dittog.; so We., Now., Dr., van H., Kau.. Hal. עֵינֶיהָ. Bu. (*EB.* 3262) om. both words as a gloss. Or. מַיִם היא. Rub. וְחוֹמֶיהָ, 'and her defenders,' of which 𝔐 מימי היא והמה and 𝔊^{A} = חומת are variants; ח׳ is connected with Ar. *ḥmy* = 'to defend.' Hap. מֵימֶיהָ, as subj. of נסים, והמה being a corrupt variant; so Marti, Now.^{K}, Stk., Kent, Du.. But this last proposal ignores the fact that the foll. ע׳ could scarcely be addressed to waters; it must be a cry to the fleeing soldiers and so bold a figure as the identification of the soldiers with 'waters' is improbable. Friedrich (*Ninive's Ende u. s. w.* p. 34), מִיְּמֵי חַיָּה היא, 'since the days of disaster.' Kl. (*SK.* 1910, p. 521), מֵימֵי הַיְאֹר, 'the waters of the river' (*i. e.* the Tigris).—והמה נסים] Probably a descriptive circumstantial clause preceding the main clause; Ges.$^{\S 141e}$.—עמדו עמדו] On עֲמֹדוּ, Ges.$^{\S 46e}$. 𝔊 *οὐκ ἔστησαν*, om. one word. 𝔖 𝔙 𝔗 = 𝔐. Bu. (*EB.* 3262) adds יאמרו; so Marti, Du.. Hpt. adds יזיקו.—**10.** בזו . . . בזו] 𝔊^{B} *διήρπασαν . . . διήρπαζον*; so 𝔖 and Gr.. Hpt. ובזו . . . ב׳. Du. בַּזּוּ.—לתכונה] For meaning 'storage,' *cf.* יכין מלבוש, Jb. 27^{16}. 𝔊 *τοῦ κόσμου αὐτῆς*; so 𝔖. Some Heb. mss. לתבונת. Gr. לתכונת. Du. לֹא תִכְּנוּ.—כבר] Rd. כְּבֹד, with We., Now.. 𝔊 *βεβάρυνται.* 𝔙 *aggravata est.* 𝔗 *consume ye.* 𝔖 = כבודים; so Hap., who om. it as a gloss. Marti and Now.^{K} (?) insert קחו לכם before כ׳. Hpt. reads כָּבֵד and inserts before it, וְשֹׁלוּ שָׁלָל. Du. הַכָּבֵד.—מכל] Rd. כל, with We., Now.. The sense must be, "a glory (or abundance) consisting in (or of) all, etc.," not "an abundance out of"; hence מ is dittog. of the foll. כ. On force of כל, *v.* Ges.$^{\S 127b}$. 𝔊^{B} *ἐπὶ πάντα*; so HP. 48, 86, 233. 𝔊^{NAQY} *ὑπὲρ π.*; HP. 22, *περὶ π.*. Hap. לְכֹל; *cf.* Migne's note on Jerome, "*Reginae ms. cum Palatinis: pro omnibus vasis.*" Du. בְּכֹל.—כלי] 𝔊 𝔖 𝔙 𝔗 = pl..—חמדה] 𝔊 *τὰ ἐπιθυμητὰ αὐτῆς* = חֶמְדָּהּ or חֶמְדָּתָהּ (so 𝔖); but six cursives om. *αὐτῆς*.—**11.** בוקה ומבוקה] Two synonyms nowhere else occurring; but evidently related to בקק, 'pour out,' 'empty.' 𝔊 *ἐκτιναγμὸς καὶ ἀνατιναγμός.* 𝔖 *dîshta washḥîfta.* Hpt. בקוקה ומבוקקה.—מבלקה] Only here and Is. 24^{1}; but Assy. *balaku*, 'destroy,' gives clear indication of the meaning. The fem. prtc. has here the force of an abstract noun; it is not unlikely that the pointing is influenced by a desire for assonance with the two preceding nouns.—נמס] 𝔊 *θραυσμός.* 𝔖 *broken.* Hpt. and *HWB.*^{15} would connect מסס with מסה and render here, "his heart becomes watery," *i. e.* his courage fails; *cf.* Ar. *masûs*, 'water' (either pure or impure); and note המסיו את לב, Jos. 14^8.—פיק] ἅπ.; but vb. is used of the tottering of an idol (Je. 10^4) and the staggering of a drunkard (Is. 28^7).—קבצו פארור] פ׳ = פַּאֲרוּר, Barth, *NB.* ^{§144}; *cf.* שַׁעֲרוּרָה , נַאֲפוּפִים , נַעֲצוּץ; perhaps 𝔐's pointing, like the readings of 𝔊 𝔖 𝔙 𝔗, was due to confusion with פָּרוּר, 'pot'; so *HWB.*^{15}. 𝔊 ὡς πρόσκαυμα χύτρας. 𝔖 *I blacken like the soot of the pot.* 𝔗 *is covered with black like a pot.* 𝔙 *sicut nigredo ollae.* Hap. כבער קבצו פ׳, supposing 𝔐 to have lost כבער which 𝔊 retained though losing קבצו, the two words being similar in their initial syllables.—**12.** ומרעה] Rd. מְעָרָה, with We.; so Or., Rub., Now., Hal., Marti, Dr., Hpt., van H., Stk., Kau., Kent; *cf.* Du. מְעָרַת.—הוא] Standing where it does in 𝔐, ה׳ converts the whole series of succeeding clauses into prosaic statements of fact. It is much better either to place it after אַיֵּה (with Hpt.; *cf.* מי הוא) or to om. it (with Marti, Kau., Du.).—לכפרים] Du. om. ל, but such rigid conformity to מעון אר׳ is not necessary.—אשר הלך א׳] Du. om. as variant of foll. clause שם גור א׳[א].—לביא] Rd. לָבוֹא, with 𝔊 τοῦ ἐισελθεῖν; so 𝔖 𝔙 and We., Or., Rub., Now., GASm., Marti, Dr. (?), Hpt., Stk., Kau., Kent, Du.. Gr. להביא. Hal. וְלבִיא. Arn. לָבִיא = 'to bring' (*cf.* 𝔗); so 𝔊^B and Hap., van H..—**13.** בדי] Hpt. כְּדֵי.—גרתיו] Du. גּוּרָיו.—מחנק] In 2 S. 17^{23} = 'strangle'; so possibly the noun in Jb. 7^{15}; Assy. *ḫanaḳu* has the same sense; but is strangling the method of slaughter characteristic of lions?—טרף . . . טרפה] Different forms either for the sake of variety or rhythm; hardly in order to indicate different kinds of prey (Hd).—חריו] 𝔊 *νοσσίαν αὐτοῦ.*—**14.** Many scholars would place all the sfs. of this verse in the 2d pers. masc. sg.; so *e. g.* Buhl, We., Dav., Now., Hap., Du.; but the thought of the city underlies the whole verse and comes to clear expression in the last word; hence the fem. sf. is suitable throughout.—והבערתי] Hal. וְהֶעֱבַרְתִּי. Du. וְהַעֲלֵיתִי.—בעשן] Some Heb. mss. כעשן. *CB.* בָּאֵשׁ; so Marti (?), Now.^{K} (?).—רכבה] Rd. רִבְצֵךְ, with Gr.; so Dav. (?), Hal., Marti, Now.^{K} (?), Hpt., Stk., Kau., Kent. 𝔊 *πλῆθός σου* = רֻבֵּךְ or רֻבְּכָה; so 𝔖 and Buhl, Arn., Hap.. 𝔙 *quadrigas tuas;* so 𝔗. Houb. מֶרְכָּבֵךְ; so Dathe. Gr. (*Psalmen* I, 136) רִכְבֵּךְ. Sm. סֻבְּכֵכָה; so We. (?), Now.. Oort רֻבֵּךְ. Rub. ארבכה, 'thy den.' Bu. (*EB.* 3262), בַּרֵךְ. Du. סְבָכֵךְ.—וכפיריך] New. כְּפָרַיִךְ, 'thy villages.' Du. הַכְּפִירִים.—ואכל] Du. תֹּאכְלֵךְ.—טרפך] Arn. טְרָפֵךְ. Hal. טַרְפֵּךְ.—מלאככה] Om. ה as dittog. from הוי in 3^1 and point sf. as fem. sg., מַלְאָכַיִךְ: so Gr., Marti, Ges. ^{§91l}, Stk. *et al.*. Some Heb. mss. מלאככָה; so We. *et al.*. 𝔊 τὰ ἔργα σου = מלאכתיך; so 𝔖. 𝔙 *nunciorum tuorum.* Mich. מָלֵא כָּכָה; so Jus.. Dathe מַלְאֲכֹתַיִךְ; so New.. Van H. מַלְאָכֶיהָ. Hap. מְלַאכְתֵּךְ; *cf.* 𝔊 𝔖. Du. מַלְבְּאֹתַיִךְ.—Marti and Now.^{K} would om. ^{14c} as a gloss; but the טרף of the foll. phrase shows that the figure of the lion is still in mind there and the clause fits well into the structure of the str..

§ 5. THE IMMINENT AND INEVITABLE END (3^{1-19}).

In six strophes addressed to Nineveh, Nahum once more exults over her approaching ruin. **Str. I** characterises the city, gives a glimpse of the coming attack upon her and states the reason for her fall; vv. $^{1-4}$. **Str. II** represents the fallen city as exposed to the taunts of the nations; vv. $^{5-7}$. **Str. III** reminds Nineveh of the fate of her ancient rival—Thebes, the queen of the Nile; vv. $^{8-10}$. **Str. IV** declares that a similar fate awaits Nineveh, notwithstanding her strength; vv. $^{11-13}$. **Str. V** ironically urges the city to put forth every effort on her own behalf, assuring her, however, that her forces will fail her in her time of need; vv. $^{14-17}$. **Str. VI,** in dirge measure, states the hopelessness of Nineveh's case and the universal joy that will greet the tidings of her fall; vv. $^{18-19}$.

OH city, bloody throughout, full of lies and booty!
Prey ceases not . . .
The crack of the whip and the noise of the rumbling wheel and the galloping horse,
And the jolting chariot and the rearing horseman;
And the flash of the sword and the glitter of the spear, and a multitude of slain;
And a mass of bodies, and no end to the carcasses;
Because of the many harlotries of a harlot of goodly favour and possessing charms,
Who sells nations by her harlotry and clans by her charms.
BEHOLD, I am against thee, it is the oracle of Yahweh of hosts, and I will uncover thy skirts upon thy face.
And I will let nations see thy nakedness and kingdoms thy shame.
And I will hurl loathsome things upon thee and treat thee with contempt and make thee a gazing-stock,
So that every one who sees thee will flee from thee and say,
"Nineveh is destroyed; who will mourn for her?
Whence can I seek comforters for her?"
ART thou better than No-Amon, that sat by the great Nile,
Whose rampart was the sea, whose wall was water?
Ethiopia was her strength; Put and the Libyans were her help.
Yet even she was for exile and went into captivity.
Even her children were dashed in pieces at the head of every street;
And upon her honoured ones did they cast lots, and all her great ones were bound in fetters.
THOU too shalt be drunken, thou shalt be faint;
Thou shalt seek refuge from the enemy.
All thy forts are fig trees; thy defenders are first-ripe figs;

If they be shaken, then they fall into the mouth of the eater.
Behold, women are in the midst of thee; fire has devoured thy bars;
To thine enemies the gates of thy land are opened wide.
DRAW thee waters for the siege; strengthen thy forts.
Enter into the mire and trample the clay; lay hold of the brick-mould.
There fire will devour thee; the sword will cut thee off.
Multiply thyself like the locust; multiply thyself like the locust-swarm.
Increase thy merchants more than the stars of heaven;
Thy sacred officials (?) like the locust-swarm, and thy scribes (?) like the locusts,
That encamp in the walls in the cool of the day;
The sun arises and they flee; their place is not known.
HOW thy shepherds slumber, thy nobles sleep!
Thy people are scattered upon the mountains with none to gather them.
There is no healing for thy wound; thy hurt is incurable.
Every one who hears the report of thee claps his hands.

Str. I first describes Nineveh as she has been, then visualises the attack to be made upon her and closes with the reason for her cruel fate.—**1.** *Oh city, wholly bloody, filled with lies and booty*] This chapter marks the opening of a new section of the prophecy, as appears from the direct address with which it begins, from the fact that in the main it repeats the thought of ch. 2, and from the difference in poetical form which it exhibits. There can be no question but that Nineveh is addressed here and throughout the chapter. Similar charges are made against her in $2^{10.\ 12.\ 13}$. The 'lies' are doubtless promises freely made to the weaker nations which were as freely broken when national aggrandisement so required. The charge of excessive cruelty implied in the use of the term 'bloody' is undoubtedly justifiable from the modern point of view; but it is doubtful whether the cruelty of Nineveh exceeded that of other oriental peoples who had like power and opportunity. It is hardly fair to charge the Assyrians with having been "the most ruthless people of antiquity."* The Hebrews themselves were none too merciful; *cf.* Ju. 8^{15-21} $9^{45.\ 49}$ 18^{27} 1 S. 15^{7-9} 2 S. 8^{2}. Indeed, the prophets use almost identical language regarding Judah and Jerusalem; *cf.* Ez. $22^{2.\ 29}$ 24^{6} 45^{9} Je. 6^{7} Ho. 11^{12}. The kind of procedure which furnished the basis for such charges against Assyria, may be discovered in abundance by reference to her own records.*—*Prey ceases not*] *Cf.* Je. 17^{8}. This statement was almost literally true; the whole of the later history of Assyria is a story of practically continuous warfare and rapine. Conformity to the poetical measure here requires the addition of a phrase in parallelism with this clause. Marti suggests, "and there is no end to the booty." Unless something be supplied, it seems necessary to treat this clause as a gloss.†—**2.** *The crack of the whip and the noise of the rumbling wheel and the rushing steed*] The prophet suddenly transports himself in imagination to the scene of the final attack upon Nineveh, which he awaits with so much eagerness and confidence. As an imaginary spectator, he calls attention to the outstanding features of the scene one by one. His method of description produces a lively effect, bringing the dash and clash of the situation vividly before us.‡—*And the jolting chariot* (**3**) *and the rearing horseman*] The meaning of the last two words is somewhat uncertain. Other renderings of them are: "the horseman making his horse to ascend, *i. e.* urging him on";§ "the horse is brought up";** "a horseman carrying himself erect";†† "a horseman going up";‡‡ "assaulting horsemen";§§ "a horseman bringing to the flame, etc."***; "he shall bring up cavalry";††† "horses which foam," literally "bringing up (saliva)."‡‡‡ But some of these yield too tame an element for so stirring a picture; others are without any support in the use of these words or in the context; and those employing the idiom "bring up" of the movements of cavalry are carrying over into Hebrew a modern phrase; in Hebrew "bring up" always retains a large measure of its original sense. This same verb is used in Je. 46^{9} to describe the rearing of horses, and probably also in Je. 51^{27} and 2 K. 9^{33}.*—*And the flash of the sword and the glitter of the spear and a multitude of slain*] The struggle is hardly begun until it is all over; the defenders of Nineveh fall before the blows of the invading army like grain before the sickle.—*And a mass of bodies, with no end to the carcasses*] A fearful carnage is thus plainly foretold; evidently, the wish was father to the thought. No account of the actual fall of Nineveh has as yet been discovered. Hence, it is impossible to say whether or not Nahum's anticipations were realised. But, judging from the character of the enemy's dealings throughout the country as a whole, it is probable that the capital city received the full measure of its deserts.†—*They stumble over the carcasses*] It is probable that these words are a marginal note which has found its way into the text; they may have been intended as a cross-reference to 2^{6}, or they may be only a variant of the preceding clause.‡ That they do not belong here appears not only from the fact that they are superfluous in the poetic form, but also from the additional fact that they introduce a verb for the first and only time into a series of phrases thrown off in ejaculatory fashion one after the other, like a series of stereopticon views.—**4.** *Because of the many harlotries of a harlot of goodly grace and mistress of enchantments*] This is the reason for the terrible catastrophe that has just been described. Just as the harlot entices men to ruin, so Assyria has lured many nations to destruction. Using all of her manifold and multiform attractions, she has succeeded in bringing nations into subjection, only to use them for the furtherance of her own selfish ends. It is not necessary to interpret this figure 'on all fours,' seeking to make 'harlotries' and 'charms' specific references to Assyria's lying and treachery. The words simply fill out the picture of a harlot and her equipment. 'Enchantments' as part of a harlot's wiles must have been something after the fashion of love-charms, love-filters, spells, and the like, which were believed to be very effective upon the hearts of men; *cf.* 2 K. 9^{22}.—*She that betrays nations by her harlotries and clans by her enchantments*] The figure of the harlot is now expressly applied to Assyria, whose almost unlimited resources led the smaller nations to rely upon her as Ahaz had caused Judah to do in the time of the Syro-Ephraimite invasion. While 'harlotries' and 'enchantments' are commonly designations of idolatrous practices, there is evidently nothing of that kind in Nahum's use of the terms here. Assyria, so far as is known, made no attempt to force her religion upon subject peoples. The word 'clans' is used, as in Am. 3^{1} Mi. 2^{3} Je. 1^{15}, in the sense of 'peoples' and is equivalent therefore to 'nations.' The word 'betray' elsewhere always means 'sell' and it has usually been so rendered here. But it is difficult to interpret 'sell' with reference to Assyria's relations to the weaker nations. Assyria's actions were more like buying than selling, for the result was the getting of the nations into her own power, rather than the delivery of them into the power of a third nation. The explanations of 'sell' as equivalent to 'rob them of their freedom,'* or 'sell into bondage, *i. e.* deliver over to destruction,'† do not obviate this difficulty. Nor does the view that the peoples were sold to idols, *i. e.* the gods of Assyria,‡ commend itself; for the prophet is not concerned, apparently, about this phase of Assyrian influence. In any case, the nations as a whole were already idolatrous from Israel's point of view, before coming under the influence of Assyria. It is better to give the word here the meaning 'deceive,' 'cheat,' which it carries in Arabic.§ Selling and cheating were somewhat closely related and may easily have been denoted by the same root.

---

* Dav.. But Hdt. (III, 159) reports, *e. g.*, that when Darius took Babylon, he impaled 3,000 prisoners and that the Scythians (IV, 64) scalped and flayed their prisoners and used the skins for horse-trappings.

---

* *E. g.* Shalmaneser Monolith, I, 16 *ff.*: "A pyramid of heads in front of his city I erected. Their young men and women I burned in a bonfire"; and II, 53 *f.*, "Pyramids of heads in front of his city gate I erected. Some in the midst of the pyramids I enclosed; others round about the pyramids I impaled on stakes." Or, the Taylor Cylinder of Sennacherib, I, 70–77, "I besieged and captured their large walled cities. I brought forth from the midst of them people, horses, mules, asses, cattle and sheep, and reckoned them as spoil; and their smaller cities, which were without number, I destroyed, devastated and reduced to plough-land. The tents, their dwelling-places, I burned with fire, and let them go up in flames." *Cf.* also Taylor Cylinder, III, 11–41; Annals of Ashurbanipal (Rassam Cylinder), V, 130–VI, 26. See Rogers, *History of Babylonia and Assyria*, II, 268. The method of impalement is shown on a bas-relief from the central palace at Nimroud; *v.* Layard, *Nineveh and Its Remains* (New York, 1849), p. 283; Guthe, *Kurzes Bibelwörterbuch*, p. 79.

† *Cf.* Hpt., Du..

‡ Jer. says of this passage: "Tam pulchra juxta Hebraicum et pictura similis ad proelium se praeparantis exercitus descriptio est, ut omnis meus sermo sit vilior." Hd. says, "The passage is unrivalled by any other, either in sacred or profane literature."

§ Cal., Br..

** Kre..

†† Mau..

‡‡ Hi..

§§ Ew..

*** Ki..

††† Os..

‡‡‡ Hal..

---

* In 2 K. 9^{33} ואל הס׳ should probably be changed to ויַּעַל הס׳.

† The Stele of Nabuna'id, says of the downfall of Assyria: "Above and below, right and left, like a cyclone he laid waste; he avenged Babylon; he multiplied vengeance. The king of the Ummanmanda, the fearless one, ruined all the temples of the gods of Assyria· and he ruined the cities on the border of Akkad, which were hostile to the king of Akkad and had not come to his help; and he did not leave one of their sanctuaries. He laid waste their cities above measure, like a cyclone."

‡ So Stk..

Str. II introduces Yahweh as addressing Nineveh and passing sentence upon her.—**5.** *Behold, I am against thee, it is the oracle of Yahweh of hosts*] *Cf.* 1^{14}.—*And I will uncover thy skirts upon thy face*] This seems to have been a part of the punishment for fornication and adultery; *cf.* Je. $13^{22.\ 26\ f.}$ Ez. $16^{36\ f.}$ Ho. $2^{3.\ 9}$. According to Billerbeck and Jeremias, it was also an Assyrian method of treating female captives; since the scenes depicted upon the bronze gates of Balawat, now in the British Museum, show women captives after the battle of Karkar as holding their skirts high above their knees, while their male companions are without any clothing (but *v. i.*)*; *cf.* Is. 20^{2-4} $47^{2.\ 3}$. This literal interpretation seems preferable to the commonly accepted rendering of the last phrase, viz. "in thy sight,"† a statement which seems superfluous when applied to such an action as is being described. The same difficulty inheres in "to thy face," *i. e.* as an insult, as in Jb. 1^{11} Is. 65^{3}.‡—*And I will let nations see thy nakedness and kingdoms thy shame*] Those who have been betrayed by Assyria will thus be compensated and avenged by seeing her undergo the humiliation she has so ruthlessly inflicted upon others.—**6.** *And I will throw loathsome things at thee and treat thee with contempt and make thee a sight*] The figure of the harlot is still maintained.§ This is probably the way in which such unfortunate women were treated by the bystanders. Yahweh speaks as though he himself were intending to participate in heaping insult and disgrace upon the offender. This is but the prophet's vivid way of representing Yahweh as the one responsible for the bringing of this retribution upon Nineveh. The view that 'loathsome things' means 'idols' and that the sense is, "I will bury thee under thy idols,"** seems forced. The word is, indeed, frequently used to indicate idols, but were this the usage here we should at least expect to find the suffix 'thy' attached to the word. As it stands, the primary sense is much more fitting. Nineveh is a captive woman exposed to shame, pelted with filth and made a spectacle for all beholders. For this latter thought, *cf.* Ez. 28^{17} Ob. $^{12 f.}$ and especially line 12 of the inscription of Mesha, king of Moab, where he says of an Israelite town, "I fought against the town and took it and slew all the town, as a spectacle for Chemosh and for Moab."—**7.** *So that every one that sees thee will flee from thee and say*] The sight of fallen Nineveh will be so ghastly that passers-by will hasten away in fright, deeming the spot accursed.—*Nineveh is destroyed. Who will mourn for her?*] A rhetorical question implying that there are none left who would regret the ruin of the oppressive city; she is absolutely friendless.—*Whence can I seek comforters for her?*] *Cf.* Je. 15^{5} Is. 51^{19}. Wildeboer* objects to this translation on the ground that comforters could not be of any service to the dead. In its place he proposes, "Whence can I seek those who will provide the funeral-offerings for her?" But the word 'comforter' is used in connection with living persons in Jb. 2^{11} Is. 66^{13}, etc., where the idea of a funeral sacrifice is out of the question. The existence of such a practice in Israel is not at all improbable, but neither this passage nor Je. 16^{7} is sufficient to establish it as one of the meanings of נחם. The prophet is here reverting to the scenes attending the last days of Nineveh and pictures her as passing through the final struggle without any attendant sympathisers and supporters. As a matter of fact, the term applied to Nineveh's overthrow (שדדה) does not necessarily imply death; but only ruin and desolation (*cf.* Mi. 2^{4}).

---

* Or..

† Dav., Dr..

‡ Hap..

§ So Hi., We., Now., Hpt., van H., *HWB.*^{15}, Du..

---

* *V.* Birch and Pinches, *The Bronze Ornaments of the Palace Gates from Balawat,* C 2 and 3, J 6. Billerbeck und Delitzsch, *Die Palasttore Salmanassars II von Balawat* [*BAS.* VI, 1; Scenes D 6, I, 3]. The action of these women, however, is more likely to have been for the purpose of facilitating their own movements in walking, for the elevation of the clothing is not extreme and unseemly as Nahum's words would imply. It is characteristic of only a few of the women captives and a similar conventional exposure of the limbs is seen on many seals in the case of men who are certainly not captives, when represented as stepping over some obstacle. *V.* the many reproductions of Assyrian and Babylonian seals in W. H. Ward's *Seal Cylinders of Western Asia* (1910) and note the representation of nude male captives in the seal reproduced on pp. 58 and 157 of that work.

† So We., Now., Marti, Dr., Kau., Du..

‡ Hpt..

§ *Contra* Now..

** So Kl.; *cf.* Hap..

Str. III reminds the reader that even so great a city and fortress as Thebes, the rival of Nineveh, had been unable to defy destruction and that Nineveh is no stronger than Thebes.—**8.** *Art thou better than No-Amon, that sitteth by the great Nile?*] No-Amon has at various times been identified with Alexandria,† with some city of the Delta,‡ and with Thebes.§ Even greater uncertainty has prevailed regarding the time of the fall of the city, some holding it to have been under Sargon;** others under Sennacherib,†† or Esarhaddon,* or Ashurbanipal,† or Nebuchadrezzar,‡ or in the time of the Scythian invasion.§ Some of the earliest commentators interpret the allusion to the fall of Thebes as a prediction of that event,** rather than a record of its actual occurrence. The objection that is made to the identification with Thebes of Upper Egypt lies in the content of the following description, *Whose rampart was a sea, whose wall was water*] This is further explained by the gloss,†† *Waters were around her*] Spiegelberg (*l. c.*) says, "One can scarcely imagine a more perverted picture of ancient Thebes than is here presented. Whoever familiarises himself with the topography of Thebes as represented by the Karnak and Luxor of our own day must acknowledge that Nahum's description is in no way fitting. The famous capital lay on the Nile, like all great Egyptian towns, but it is simply unthinkable that it could have been strategically protected either by the river or by canals. Spiegelberg, therefore, applies Nahum's description to a Thebes in the Delta. In reply to this, it must be said that Nahum would scarcely have compared Nineveh with any but the most powerful city of Egypt and that the Thebes of lower Egypt was by no means such a city. It played no conspicuous part in the long history of Egypt. Nor is the application to Thebes proper so unthinkable as is maintained. When the Nile rises, it overflows the site of Thebes, the waters ascending several feet on the walls of the Temple at Karnak. At such times, the city might well have been described as protected by a sea, or surrounded by waters. An illustration of such a situation is furnished in the capture of Memphis by Piankhi (*c.* 721 B.C.). Though Memphis lay more than a mile from the river, the inundation had raised the level of the river until it was almost to the top of the eastern wall of the city. Trusting to the water for protection on that side, the defenders had neglected to strengthen their fortifications there. Piankhi, taking advantage of that fact, brought his fleet right up to the city wall and landed his soldiers upon the top of it, thus mastering the town.‡‡ Then, too, there may have been great moats about the city which were filled by the flood-waters and remained as a permanent defence when the river subsided.[*] If so, the defences of Thebes must have been remarkably similar to those of Nineveh herself and the prophet's comparison of the two would be very forceful. The existence of moats at Thebes is rendered more than probable by the fact that as early as the nineteenth century B.C. the Egyptians were employing this means of defence. The city fortress of Semneh in lower Nubia, situated on the west bank of the Nile about forty miles above Halfeh, was so protected.[†] Furthermore, allowance must be made for the fact that Nahum had almost certainly never seen Thebes and consequently was dependent for his information upon the reports of merchants and travellers. Under such conditions, a certain degree of exaggeration in the description is excusable and to be expected, finding a parallel in the exaggeration of Nineveh's own size as given in Jon. 3^3. For other instances of the word 'sea' as applied to a river, *cf.* Is. 19^5 18^2(?) Jb. 14^{11}, in which the Nile is so designated, and Je. 51^{36} where it denotes the Euphrates.[‡] The fame of Thebes was spread throughout the ancient world.[§] It was the first great city of the orient and even to-day the remnants of its greatness are described as "the mightiest ruins of ancient civilisation to be found anywhere in the world."[**] It came into prominence about 2100 B.C. and from that time to its fall held a leading place in Egypt, though with varying fortunes, attaining its greatest glory under the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties (1580–1205 B.C.) and entering upon its decline with the twenty-first dynasty (1090–945 B.C.) whose rulers removed the seat of government to the Delta. Its location was about 440 miles south of Memphis and 140 miles north of the first cataract of the Nile, where the river comes closest to the Red Sea and its narrow valley opens out into a wide and fertile plain. Here the river is about a half-mile wide, but is divided into smaller streams by three islands which lie opposite the city. Thebes proper lay on the east bank of the Nile, the west bank being given over almost wholly to the necropolis and the mortuary temples. The old Egyptian names of Thebes were "the city," "the southern city," and "the city of Amon" as here. Amon was the patron god of the city and the temple of Karnak was erected for his worship. For the date of the overthrow of Thebes and its bearing upon the question of the date of Nahum's prophecy, *v.* Introduction, pp. 274 *f.*.—**9.** *Ethiopia was her strength; Put and the Libyans were her help*] At the time when Thebes fell, the land of Egypt was under the dominion of the Ethiopian, or twenty-fifth dynasty (712–663 B.C.). All the resources of Nubia, therefore, were joined to those of Egypt proper. Added to these helpers from the south were the Libyans, neighbours of Egypt on the west. The precise location of Put is uncertain. It seems here to be thought of as closely associated with Libya. In Ez. 27^{10}, it is mentioned with Lud and Persia as among the allies of Tyre; in 30^5 and Je. 46^{10}, it is coupled with Ethiopia and Lud as an ally of Egypt; in Ez. 38^5, it is among the forces of Gog; while in Is. 66^{19}, where Pul is probably an error for Put (*cf.* 𝔊), it is again associated with Lud and also Tarshish as one of the lands far removed from Israel. It is commonly identified with the Punt of the Egyptian inscriptions, which is the present Somali coast of the Red Sea. This may be correct; but, as Dillmann pointed out with reference to Gn. 10^6, there is no evidence that Egypt ever made use of mercenaries or allies from Punt. It was known to Egypt chiefly as a source of trade in rare products. It may be of significance, in this connection, that the abstract 'help' is used here by Nahum rather than the concrete 'helper'; the former might, of course, include all kinds of resources. But whatever may be thought of Punt as likely to have aided Thebes, it is almost inconceivable that Tyre should have drawn aid from so distant a point (Ez. 27^{10}). 𝔊 sometimes renders Put as Libya or Libyans,* but the fact that the Lydians are listed here with Put seems to preclude that identification. Winckler would equate Put with the Assyrian Puṭu-

---

* *ZAW*. XXII, 318 *f*.; *cf*. Schw. *ZAW*. XI, 253 *ff*..

† So 𝔙 𝔗, Ra., Cal., Hap. *et al*..

‡ So Kalinsky, Kre., Brugsch (*Dict. Géogr.* 291), Spiegelberg (*Ægypt. Randglossen zum A. T.* 31 *ff*.).

§ So Bochart (*Geogr. sacra*, 1681, vol. I, i, 6 *ff*.), Dathe, Mich., Eich., Rosenm., Mau., Hi., Ew., Or., and practically all recent interpreters.

** Hi., Um., Pu., Ke. *et al*..

†† Gre., Kre..

---

* Kalinsky, Br..

† Or..

‡ Bochart.

§ Ges..

** Jer., Theodoret, Cyril.

†† So also Bu. (*EB.* 3262), Marti, Hpt., Now.^{K}, Kau..

‡‡ *V.* Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt*, IV 411 *f.*, 434 *f.*, and *History of Egypt* (1905), 543.

---

[*] *Cf.* W. M. Müller, *EB.* 3427.

[†] A vast moat, constructed of stone, appears distinctly upon photograph 1024 of this site taken by the Egyptian Expedition of the University of Chicago (1905–1907) under the direction of Professor J. H. Breasted, who kindly called my attention to this fact.

[‡] The Ar. *baḥr* is used in the same way; while, conversely, in Assy. the term 'river' is applied to the sea· *e. g. nâru marratu* = 'the bitter river,' viz. the Persian Gulf.

[§] *Cf.* ἑκατόμπυλοι Θῆβαι (*Iliad*, IX, 381–383).

[**] Breasted, *A History of Egypt* (1905), 149, where a full story of the rise and fall of Thebes may be found.

---

* So also Josephus.

Yamen,[*] the name of the isle of Samos or some part of the coast of Asia Minor, such as Caria near Samos.[†] It seems unnecessary to look so far away as either Asia Minor or the Somali coast for Put, for the other allies named are immediate neighbours of Egypt; but its exact localisation must await further discoveries. Unfortunately Ashurbanipal's account of the campaigns against Egypt and of the capture of Thebes does not enumerate the foreign auxiliaries in the army of Taharka, king of Ethiopia and Egypt. 𝔐 reads here, "Ethiopia was her strength and Egypt, and there was no end; Put, etc." But the inclusion of Egypt among the resources of Thebes, the capital of Egypt, seems gratuitous and the list seems designed to give the external helpers who co-operated with Egypt. In any case, if 'Egypt' were originally in the text, we should have expected some word parallel to 'strength' as its predicate.[‡] It seems safe to omit "and Egypt"[§] as well as "and there was no end"[**] as due to a glossator.—**10.** *Yet she was for exile; she went into captivity*] In Ashurbanipal's account of the capture of Thebes, he says, "that entire city, under the protection of Ashur and Ishtar, my hands captured—silver, gold, precious stones, the contents of his palace, all that there was: parti-coloured raiment, cloth, horses, and people, male and female. Two tall obelisks . . . I removed from their place and took to Assyria. Heavy spoils without number I carried off from Thebes." This does not imply a general deportation of the populace of Thebes; but it furnishes sufficient basis for Nahum's statement, especially if made after the lapse of approximately half a century, when the recollection of the precise course of events had become hazy and imagination had done its work.—*Even her infants were dashed in pieces at the head of every street*] Such barbaric cruelty seems to have been commonly practised in Semitic warfare; *cf.* 2 K. 8^{12} Is. $13^{16.\ 18}$ Ho. 10^{14} 14^{1}. Israelites themselves were capable of such atrocities (2 K. 15^{16}), though there were not wanting those who protested against such doings (Am. 1^{13}).—*And upon her honoured ones, they cast lots and all her great ones were bound in fetters*] In the record of the activities immediately preceding Ashurbanipal's second campaign, of which the capture of Thebes was the crowning triumph, it is stated that the petty kings who had conspired with Tirhaka to resist the Assyrian advance were taken captive to Nineveh, where mercy was shown to none but Necho, king of Ṣais, the fate of the rest being left to be inferred. Details are not furnished by this narrative of the conqueror, but the custom of putting noble prisoners in bonds is well attested elsewhere in Assyrian inscriptions and reliefs (*cf.* Je. $40^{1.\ 4}$ 2 K. 25^{7} Ju. 16^{21} Ps. 149^{8}) and the distribution of prominent captives by lot among the princes and captains of Assyria is likely to have been a not unusual proceeding (*cf.* Jo. 3^{3} Ob. ^{11}).*

---

[*] *AOF.* I, 511 *f.*.

[†] So Che. *EB.* art. *Put.*

[‡] So Rub. *JQR.* XI, 459.

[§] So Marti, Hpt..

[**] So Hpt., Stk..

Str. IV declares that Nineveh will in turn suffer the fate which she herself executed upon Thebes.—**11.** *Thou, too, wilt be drunken; thou wilt become faint*] The figure of drunkenness as representative of the helplessness of those who have drunk of the cup of Yahweh's wrath is a common one in the Old Testament; *cf.* Hb. 2^{16} Je. 25^{15-27} Ob. ^{16} Ez. $23^{33\,f.}$ Is. 51^{17-23} Ps. 60^{3} La. 4^{21}. The precise meaning of the second verb here is somewhat uncertain. The root regularly means 'cover,' conceal.' The meaning 'faint,' 'be powerless' for this passage† rests upon two facts; (1) Arabic has exactly the same idiom, using 'be covered' as = 'be powerless'; (2) the verb עלף, with a similar primary meaning,‡ is used in this same way in Is. 51^{20} Jon. 4^{8} Am. 8^{13} Ez. 31^{15}.§ The blackness before the eyes that accompanies fainting may have furnished the connecting link between 'covering' and 'fainting.' Another interpretation of the word is,

---

* For representations of prisoners, *v.* the reliefs from Kouyunjik and Khorsabad in Botta et Flandin, *Monuments de Ninive* (1849), vol. II, plates 100, 119; *cf.* Layard, *Nineveh and Its Remains*, II, 261; and *Assyrian Sculptures in the British Museum* (published by Kleinman & Co., London), plate 93. Ashurbanipal, in his Annals, speaking of his fifth campaign, says, "Dunanu and Samgunu (allies of Elam), who had obstructed the exercise of my sovereignty, I bound hand and foot in bonds, iron fetters and iron manacles." So also in his ninth campaign, against Arabian princes, of whom he says "On their hands and feet I put iron chains and along with the spoil of their land, I took them to Assyria." Similarly Sennacherib, in the Taylor Prism, after his sixth campaign. Tiglath-pileser III also, in the *Nimrud Ins.* says, "I captured him (a hostile king) together with his great men, put iron chains on them and took them to Assyria."

† So *e. g.* Stei., We., Or., Dav., Now., Hpt..

‡ עטף = 'to cover' and עטף = 'be weak' are also probably one and the same.

§ In Ez. 31^{15} עֻלָפָה should be read.

'wilt hide thyself from fear,'* which anticipates the thought of the following line. In any case, as Nowack reminds us, drunkards as a rule do not hide themselves. The Versions offer 'will be despised,' which is supported by some scholars† on the basis of Jb. 42^{3}; but there the ordinary meaning 'covers,' *i. e.* obscures counsel, satisfies the context and renders unnecessary so unsupported an interpretation.—*Thou, too, wilt seek refuge from the foe*] The pursuer will become the pursued,—an unaccustomed rôle for Assyrian armies.—**12.** *All thy fortresses are fig trees; thy defenders are first-ripe figs*] 𝔐 reads, "are fig trees with first-ripe figs." Against this is the fact that it is lacking in parallelism and that it yields too short a line. The corrected text presupposes an error in 𝔐 which is of common occurrence in the copying of texts. The fortresses referred to are probably those strengthening and protecting the walls of Nineveh itself,‡ as is evidently the case in v. ^{14}; but, in view of v. ^{13}, it is also possible that forts on the frontier and others intended to block progress toward the capital are meant.§ For the use of the word 'people' as the equivalent of 'defenders,' *cf.* note on 2^{9}.—*If they be shaken, they fall into the mouth of the eater*] To urge that first-ripe figs do not fall more easily than later figs and that, therefore, the point of the comparison is in the speed and eagerness with which first-ripe figs are plucked,** rather than in the ease and certainty of the capture of Nineveh, is to lay too much stress upon the use of this particular word. Both ideas are probably present in the figure; Nineveh is as eagerly pounced upon and falls with as little resistance as does the first-ripe fig; *cf.* Mi. 7^{1} Is. 28^{4} Je. 24^{2}. Haupt would transfer vv. $^{12.\ 13}$ to follow v. ^{15a}, while Staerk places v. ^{12} after v. ^{14a}. But nothing is gained by either of these changes.—**13a.** *Behold, women are in the midst of thee!*] Such terror will lay hold upon the defenders of Nineveh that they will be unable to act the part of men. Courage will utterly fail them; *cf.* Is. 19^{16} Je. 49^{22} 50^{37} 51^{30}.†† As a matter of fact, the defence of Nineveh was prolonged and heroic. Thus it would seem clear that Nahum prophesied before the siege had actually begun. This is no *vaticinium post eventum.* 𝔐 reads, "Behold, thy defenders are women in the midst of thee." The sense is the same in both readings; but the order of words is easier in the emended text and the phrase "in the midst of thee" in 𝔐 is somewhat superfluous.—**13c.** *Fire has devoured thy bars*] The bars are either the forts which obstruct the advance of an invader into the country, or the literal bars which fasten the gates of such fortresses; *cf.* Am. 1^5. They can hardly be the fastenings of the gates of Nineveh itself, for this would leave the city at the mercy of the enemy and the following instructions to prepare for a siege would be absurd. The use of fire in attacks upon fortresses seems implied here.* In any case, one of the constantly recurring statements in the accounts of the capture of cities by Assyrian kings is, "I destroyed, I devastated, I burned with fire."† This clause more fittingly follows v. ^{13a} than v. ^{13b} as in 𝔐. It would be unnecessary to burn the bars after the gates were opened. Moreover, the metre is much improved by this arrangement.—**13b.** *The gates of thy land are opened wide to thine enemies*] *i. e.* the forts protecting the passes and defiles affording entrance into the country are surrendered without a struggle by their cowardly garrisons. Driver aptly calls attention to the parallel usage of the word 'gates' in such titles as the "Caucasian Gates," the "Caspian Gates," the "Cilician Gates," etc.. It may be that Nahum was writing at a time when these strongholds had already fallen, so that it only remained to conquer Nineveh.‡ But it is just as probable that with prophetic certainty he represents as already accomplished that which he sees to be inevitable.§

---

* Hal..

† Hap., van H..

‡ So *e. g.* We., Now., Hap., Marti, Kau..

§ So *e. g.* Dav., van H..

** Hap..

†† Similar language is used by Ashur-nirari, king of Assyria, in a wish he utters with reference to a certain Mali'ilu of Ḥarran, viz. "may he become a hierodule; may his warriors become women, etc."; *v.* E. T. Harper, *BAS.* II, 434.

Str. V ironically urges Nineveh to put forth her most strenuous efforts in self-defence, assuring her in one and the same breath that complete destruction awaits her.—**14.** *Waters for the siege draw for thyself*] This ironical advice may refer either to the filling of Nineveh's moats for the purpose of better defence,** or to the procuring of a water supply for its inhabitants before the presence of the enemy renders it impossible.* *Cf.* the steps taken by Ahaz to secure the water supply of Jerusalem at the time of the Syro-Ephraimite invasion (Is. 7^3). A copious water supply had been provided for Nineveh by Sennacherib. In the Bavian Inscription,† he relates how he had conveyed the water of eighteen mountain torrents into the city by an aqueduct, thus furnishing it with an abundant supply. Not only so, but he also constructed a system of water-works by which the storage and distribution could be controlled and a plentiful supply guaranteed in time of siege. Nahum probably refers to the perfecting and protecting of this system. Apart from it, according to Sennacherib, the city was dependent solely upon the rainfall.‡—*Strengthen thy fortresses*] Reference is made probably to the defences of Nineveh proper, the towers and turrets upon her walls and the outlying bulwarks designed to protect her gates. The same verb is used in 2 K. 12^{8-14} of the repairing of the breaches in the walls of the temple. Constant repairs upon the walls of the city and its forts would be needed during the progress of the siege, because of the damage wrought by the rams of the besiegers; lacking such repairs, the walls must soon fall.§—*Enter into the mire and trample the clay*] *i. e.* so as to prepare the clay for the moulding of the bricks. An enormous supply of bricks would be requisite to keep up repairs upon the huge walls of Nineveh during a siege.** Their height was estimated at one hundred feet by Diodorus and their width, as revealed by the excavations, was about fifty feet, except alongside of the gates where it was over one hundred feet. Sennacherib himself says* that he made the wall and the rampart of Nineveh "mountain high." But limestone also was used in the construction of the walls and earth in the erection of ramparts.—*Lay hold of the brick-mould*] Sun-dried and burnt brick was the chief building material of Assyria and Babylonia. This picture shows the population of Nineveh engaged in the most wearisome drudgery and all in vain.—**15.** *There fire will devour thee; the sword will cut thee off*] "There" probably indicates in a general way the scenes of labour just mentioned. Even in the midst of their toil, destruction will come upon them. Fire and sword are commonly combined in the destruction of towns; *cf.* Dt. 28^{22} Ju. $1^{8.\ 25}$ 20^{37-48} 1 S. $30^{1.\ 14}$ 1 K. 9^{16} Is. 1^{7} Je. 34^{2} Am. $1^{4\ \mathrm{ff.}}$ Ho. 8^{14}. According to one form of the Babylonian tradition preserved by Berossus, the last king of Assyria upon learning of the advance of the enemy set fire to his own capital and perished in the flames. According to another form, the king resisted the besiegers for three years and committed himself to the flames only after the Tigris had washed away a portion of the city's walls. The excavations at Kouyunjik have revealed the fact that most of the buildings there had suffered from fire.—*It will devour thee like the young locust*] These words are best treated as a gloss or as due to dittography.† The error was an easy one. The words are hard to understand in 𝔐. Most naturally, the subject of the verb would be the 'sword' just mentioned;‡ but locusts are not destroyed by the sword. If the comparison with the locust applies to the subject, *i. e.* "the sword will devour thee as the locust devours,"§ the figure is a weak one. Moreover, in the following clause, the 'locust' is applied figuratively to Nineveh, the devoured. If the thought be, "will devour thee though thou art numerous like the locust,** it anticipates and renders forceless the following phrase. If the words be original here, they must go back for a subject to the preceding 'fire,' viz. "fire will devour thee like the locust"; this was one of the means of exterminating this pest.* One interpreter seeks to save the phrase by making it mean, "fire and sword shall rage against thee as furiously as they are made to destroy the baneful flood of locusts."† But this is to crowd too much into two words. Another, by emendation, reads, "the battle-axe will destroy thee." But this, in turn, introduces a new word into the Hebrew lexicon, adds a superfluous detail since 'sword' naturally represents all weapons of warfare, and fails to reckon with the fact that these words render this line unduly long.—*Multiply thyself like the young locust; multiply thyself like the locust-swarm*] The prophet now turns from the forts and walls toward the almost innumerable mass of the population within Nineveh, bidding the city increase its defenders beyond measure only to find them as futile as the broken-down walls. —**16.** *Increase thy traders more than the stars of the heavens*] The merchants of Nineveh were an important source of her wealth; and, in her case, commerce regularly "followed the flag." It may be that the merchandise alluded to here is of the same sort as that mentioned in 3^{4};‡ but this does not appear on the face of the statement and the additional classes mentioned in v. ^{17} render such a meaning somewhat improbable.—*The young locust strips and flies away*] This probably refers to the final emergence of the locust from the *pupa*-stage, at which time it casts off the membraneous sheaths which have thus far confined its wings, rises into the air and flies away.§ Another possible rendering is, "the young locust plunders and flies away." But it is hardly legitimate to apply this to the departure of the enemy from Nineveh after her destruction;** since in vv. $^{15.\ 17}$ the locusts evidently represent the Assyrians themselves. Another interpretation†† gives the first verb the meaning 'go forth' or 'set themselves in motion,' and cites Ju. $9^{33.\ 44}$ in support of this. But so weak and colourless a meaning is not to be expected of this verb, nor is it made necessary by Ju. $9^{33.\ 44}$, where the rendering "make a raid" is more suitable. Still another interpretation is "the locusts deposit their larvae, etc.";‡‡ but this meaning must be

---

* *Cf.* Billerbeck, *BAS.* III, 161.

† So *e. g.* in Ashurbanipal's *Annals.*

‡ So *e. g.* We., Now., Kau., *et al.*.

§ So *e. g.* Hap., van H..

** Hpt.'s categorical rejection of this interpretation proves nothing.

---

* A bas-relief from the NW. palace at Nimroud shows a warrior outside the walls of a city cutting a bucket from a rope passed through a pulley, which was apparently used by the besieged to obtain water from a well outside the walls of the fort; *v.* Layard, *Nineveh and Its Remains*, II, 31 *f.*. Billerbeck suggests that Nahum refers to boiling water which is to be poured upon the besiegers.

† Bezold's translation in *KB.* II, 117.

‡ Testimony varies regarding the waters of the Khusur and Tigris. Layard (*Nineveh and Its Remains*, II, 96) states that the water of the Khusur was considered heavy and undrinkable, while that of the Tigris was constantly used. Commander Jones (*JRAS*, 1855, p. 310) evidently considered the waters of both streams usable; while Friedrich (*Ninive's Ende*), apparently without having been on the spot, declares the water of the Khusur to be good and that of the Tigris undrinkable; so Billerbeck, *BAS.* III, 120. Sennacherib also seems to have considered the Khusur available for a water supply, for he used it as a part of his system of waterworks (Bavian Ins., l. 11).

§ *Cf.* Billerbeck, *BAS.* III, 161, where an excellent account of the defences of Nineveh may be found; *v.* also *idem*, *Der Festungsbau im Alten Orient* (2d ed. 1903).

** Xenophon, *Anabasis*, III, 4, 11, mentions the *πλίνθινον τεῖχος* of Nineveh.

---

* *V.* Bavian Inscription.

† So *e. g.* We., Rub. (*JQR.* XI, 459), Oort$^{\mathrm{Em.}}$, Now.^{1}, GASm., Hap., Marti, Dr. (?), Now.$^{\mathrm{K}}$, Hpt., Stk., Kent.

‡ Hi..

§ The Vrss., Strauss, Knabenbauer, Dr. (?), and most earlier commentators.

** Or., Dav..

---

* *V.* Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, II (1886), 297; and the "excursus on locusts" in Dr. *Joel and Amos*, 82–91.

† Van H..

‡ So Hap.; *cf.* Is. $23^{17\,f.}$.

§ So Dr. *Joel and Amos*, 85; Shipley, *EB.* 2808.

** So Strauss, Kl., Ke., Knabenbauer; *cf.* Marti, Hal..

†† Hap..

‡‡ Van H..

forced upon the verb and even then furnishes no suitable *tertium comparationis*. The point of the comparison evidently is that the crowds of Nineveh will disappear as quickly and completely as locust-swarms when their time comes. But the phrase anticipates the thought of v. ^{17}, has no close connection with v. ^{16a} and is superfluous in the poetical structure. It is best handled as a marginal note either on v. ^{15} or on v. ^{17}.[*]—**17.** *Thy sacred officials* (?) *like the locust-swarm*] These words may be taken either as an independent sentence, "thy sacred officials are like, etc.," or as dependent upon the imperative of v. ^{16}, "increase thy sacred officials, etc.." The latter seems preferable, since the merchants with the other two orders mentioned are apparently correlated as representing three leading classes in Nineveh. The word here rendered "sacred officials (?)" occurs nowhere else and is of uncertain meaning. It has been interpreted in many ways; *e. g.* thy princes, or crowned ones;[†] thy consecrated ones, *i. e.* those set aside to war (*cf.* בחור);[‡] thy mercenaries;[§] thy bastards, allusion being made to the large admixture of foreign blood in Nineveh;[**] thy tax-collectors;[††] thy exorcists, or conjurers;[‡‡] thy watchmen, or guards.[§§] Reference can hardly be made to any high officials, since at any given time these were relatively few and the comparison with locusts would thus be unsuitable.[***] Some class including large numbers is apparently intended, perhaps the priests and attendant ministers at the many shrines. The term is probably an Assyrian loan-word, the meaning of which we can only conjecture.—*Thy scribes* (?) *like the locusts*] Another word of uncertain significance appears here. The earlier commentators conjectured such meanings as 'captains,'[†††] marshals,[‡‡‡] princes or leaders.[§§§] The same word, with a slight variation in vocalisation, occurs in Je. 51^{27}; but that passage sheds little light upon its meaning, beyond showing that it is a designation of some kind of an official. The Assyrian *dupšarru* or *tupšarru* is almost certainly the original of this Hebrew form. In

---

[*] So Marti, Hpt., Stk., Kent.

[†] Ra., Ki., Hd., Or., AV. *et al.*.

[‡] Ke..

[§] Ew..

[**] Hi., We..

[††] Du..

[‡‡] Hpt.; *cf.* Rub. (*JQR.* XI, 460), Bu. (*EB.*).

[§§] So Jensen (*ThLZ.* 1905, p. 507), Zimmern (*KAT.*^{3}, 651), Knabenbauer, Hal., Kent.

[***] So Mau., We..

[†††] AV., Ew., Or..

[‡‡‡] RV..

[§§§] AE., Ki..

Assyrian, the ordinary meaning is "tablet-writer" or "scribe," but the scribe served also at times as an official of the government. The Hebrew סֹפֵר, 'scribe' or 'secretary' is also used to designate a military officer (Ju. 5^{14} 2 Ch. 26^{11} 2 K. 25^{19}; *cf.* 1 Mac. 5^{42}). A similar development is exhibited by the root שׁטר. In view of these facts, it is probable that טפסר too had both meanings, viz. 'scribe' and 'officer.' The objection that this is too special a meaning for this place,* is of force, if we must think of either as constituting a very small class. But scribes, at least, were abundant, especially in and after the literary age of Ashurbanipal.† The suggestion‡ that Nahum is deriding Nineveh by implying that the stalwart warriors of her days of power have given place to merchants, scribes, and the like, may be near the mark, being wholly in keeping with the spirit and tone of this prophecy.—*That encamp in the walls in cold weather*] A well-known characteristic of locusts.§ So Nineveh is crammed with a huddled mass of population.—*But the sun shines forth and they flee and their place is not known*] The similarity between the people of Nineveh and the locusts is in the speed with which they both alike depart and are lost to sight.** The details of the figure evidently must not be applied to the people of Nineveh. For the closing words, *cf.* Ps. 103^{16} Is. 17^{14} Jb. 7^{10} Rev. 18^{21}; but the thought here is that none knows whither the locust has gone, not where he has been. 𝕸 adds a word here, making the phrase read, "their place is not known where they are." This is a correct interpretation of Nahum's words, but it is generally recognised as weak and tautological and as not belonging here.†† It is better placed, with a slight change, at the beginning of v. ^{18}.

---

* Now..

† They were highly regarded by that king, who himself acquired their art (Annals, I, 32 *f.*) and employed many of them in copying ancient tablets and collecting his great library. In the Tel-el-Amarna period, the *dupšarru* at the Egyptian court was credited with great influence, *v.* Knudtzon's *El-Amarna Tafeln*, Nos. 286, l. 61; 287, ll. 64 *f.*; 289, l. 47, where Abdiḫiba, king of Jerusalem, entreats the favour of his influence with the Pharaoh.

‡ Van H..

§ *V.* Jer. *ad loc.*; Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, II (1886), 299.

** *V.* Thomson, *op. cit.* p. 297: "thousands upon thousands, with most fatal industry, deposit their innumerable eggs in the field, the plain, and the desert. This done, they vanish like morning mist."

†† So Arn., Hap., Marti, Hpt., Stk., Kent, Du..

Str. VI which closes this oracle and the book does not carry the thought of the preceding str. any further, but takes up a dirge over the city, fallen to rise no more, and tells of the joy with which the whole world receives the tidings.—**18.** *How thy shepherds slumber, thy nobles sleep!*] The so-called dirge rhythm appears here and continues to the end of the str.. 𝔐 inserts here *O King of Assyria*] which not only spoils the dirge rhythm, but also introduces a new personality at the very end of the prophecy. It is probably a gloss.* "Thy shepherds" is a phrase much more naturally addressed to a city than to a king, who is himself the shepherd of his people. The title "shepherd" was a favourite one with Semitic rulers; *cf.* Je. 3^{15} Ez. 37^{24}.† The slumber and sleep are not pictures of the slothfulness and weakness of Assyria's rulers.‡ The vigour and obstinacy of the city's defence, which withstood the attacks of the foe for at least two long years, protects the memory of her defenders against such a charge. Sleep is here rather a euphemism for death (*cf.* Is. 14^{18} Je. $51^{39.\ 57}$ Ps. 13^{3} $76^{5.\ 6}$), and the prophet is describing the situation after the fall of the capital.§ 𝔐 has "settle down" or "dwell" for the second verb; if correct, this must be understood as meaning "are at ease" or "secure," which would be a very free rendering. But a closer parallelism with "slumber" is expected and 𝔊 points to a different text.—*Thy people are scattered upon the mountains with none to gather them*] The "people" are the defenders of the city, as in v. ^{13}. They have forsaken her and are like sheep without a shepherd; *cf.* 1 K. 22^{17} Ez. 34^{6} Zc. 13^{7} Nu. 27^{17}.—**19.** *There is no healing for thy wound; thy hurt is incurable*] For similar language, *cf.* Je. 10^{19} 14^{17} 30^{12} 46^{11}. Amos threatened Israel with the same fate (5^{2}). The word 'wound' is commonly applied to the crash of states (*e. g.* Am. 6^{6} Is. 30^{26} Je. 8^{21}), though it is occasionally used of individuals (*e. g.* Pr. 16^{18} 17^{19} 18^{12}).—*All who hear the report of thee clap their hands*] For this action as expressive of joy, *cf.* Is. 55^{12} Ez. 25^{6} Ps. 47^{2} 98^{8}. The prophet here states even more positively what he has already suggested in 3^{7}. He is conscious that he expresses the feelings not only of his own nation, but of all the peoples who have suffered at the hands of the world-oppressing tyrant. 𝔐 adds here, *at thee*] But this is unnecessary to the sense and constitutes a blemish upon the otherwise perfect elegiac rhythm. It is probably the work of a glossator.*—*For upon whom has evil from thee not passed over continually?*] This, too, is best considered as a gloss.† It fails to conform to the metre of this closing str. and it weakens the prophet's climax. It is an attempt to justify the universal joy of the previous statement, which needed no such prosaic apology in the days of Nahum. The oppression of Nineveh was notorious enough to be taken for granted everywhere. "Evil" here is equivalent to "calamity," "disaster" or "wrong."

---

* So Arn., Marti, Hap., Now.^{K}, Hpt., Stk., Kau., Kent; Du. om. only the word "king" and leaves "Assyria" as the one addressed.

† So *e. g.* Tiglath-pileser I (Prism Ins. I, 18), Sennacherib (Taylor Cyl. I, 3) and Shamash-shum-ukin.

‡ *Contra* many commentators; *e. g.* Mich., Kre., We., van H..

§ So Or., Dav., GASm., Jrm., Hap., Marti, Hal., Dr..

The logical divisions of this piece are so clearly marked as to have produced practical unanimity among its interpreters regarding its analysis. Organising strs. on the basis of this logical grouping alone, and trusting to the parallelism for guidance as to the length of lines, we secure six strs., having 8, 6, 6, 6, 8 and 4 lines respectively. This involves a few changes from 𝔐. In v. ^{2}, one-half of the second line is missing. In v. ^{3}, two words, יכשלו בג׳, must be om. as a gloss. Other glosses are, מים סביב לה (v. ^{8}), עמך (v. ^{13}), האכלך כילק (v. ^{15}), ילק פשט ויעף (v. ^{16}), מלך אשור (v. ^{18}), and probably ומצרים ואין קצה (v. ^{9}) and עליך כי על מי לא עברה רעתך תמיד (v. ^{19}). In addition to these omissions, the phrase אכלה אש ב׳ (v. ^{13}) is tr. to foll. בקרבך in the same verse. This strophic arrangement gives a sharper point to We.'s question as to whether vv. $^{18.\ 19}$ constitute an original element in the poem or not. Strophic symmetry demands the closing of the poem with v. ^{17}, where an eight-line str. ends, thus balancing the eight-line str. with which the poem began. These verses also seem to look back upon the overthrow of Nineveh as an accomplished fact; whereas all that precedes has looked forward to the fall of the city as a thing hoped for and confidently expected at no distant date. It cannot be said with certainty, of course, that Nahum is not here in imagination placing himself at some point in the future, whence he looks back upon Nineveh's ruin. This is a common enough method of procedure with the prophets. Hence, the question of the date of vv. $^{18.\ 19}$ must remain open, with the probability upon the side of the later origin.

The metres of this piece, like all the rest of the book of Nahum, are very uneven; lines of four, five, six and seven beats are all found here, but with a preference for the line of six beats. The *qina*-rhythm appears here and there throughout the poem, but is consistently adhered to only in vv.$^{18. 19}$, where it is the natural measure for the sentiment.

---

* So Bu. (*EB.*), Marti, Now.^{K}.

† So Marti, Hpt., Kent.

1. הוי] *V.* H.$^{AH. 127}$; *cf.* Dr.. Du. adds נינוה.—דָּמִים] Tr. ָ to כלה mtr. cs..—כלה] 𝔊 𝔙 ignore sf..—כחש] Du. כֶּחָשָׁה.—פרק] ἅπ. in this sense; *cf.* Ob.^{14}. 𝔊 *ἀδικίας*; similarly 𝔖. Aq. *ἐξαυχενισμοῦ.* Σ *ἀποτομίας* or *μελοκοπίας.* 𝔙 *dilaceratione.* 𝔗 בזא, 'booty.' Gr. שֶׁקֶר. Rub. (*JQR.* XI, 458) proffers פרץ, 'lies,' as the original of this and also of פרש in v.^{3}, which with מעלה he considers a misplaced marginal note on פרק. But כרץ in meaning 'lies' is ἅπ. in Heb. (*cf.* Assy.) and thus possesses no advantage over פרק. Du. יָפֶרֶק.—מלאה] For inverted position within the phrase, *cf.* Is. 22^{2}.—ימיש] Intrans. as in Jos. 1^{8} Ex. 13^{22} Ps. 55^{12} Zc. 14^{4}. 𝔊 *ψηλαφηθήσεται*; similarly 𝔖. Σ (*ὅπου*) *ἀδιάλειπτος.*—טרף] Probably here the act of plunder rather than the plunder itself. The corresponding nominal form in Ar. is regularly used for the inf.. Gr. טֹּרֶף. Hal. adds בְּרֻהֹבָה; *cf.* Ps. 55^{12}. Rub. (*l. c.*) adds מִקִּרְבָּהּ. Marti suggests the addition וְאֵין־קֵצֶה לַמְּרֵפָה; so Now.^{K}.—**2.** שוט] 𝔊 pl..—וקול] The metre would be improved by the om. of ק׳ as a dittog..—רעש] Though used for 'earthquake,' it is difficult to refer it here to the trembling of the ground as the chariots dash by (BDB.); it is rather the noise made by the wheels themselves.—דהר] ἅπ.; but *cf.* דהרות, Ju. 5^{22}. Barth (*Wurzeluntersuchungen*) and Hpt. connect with Ar. *hdr* by metathesis and render 'neighing.' *Cf.* 𝔖 *snorting;* 𝔙 *frementis.* 𝔊 *διώκοντος.*—מרקדה] 𝔊 *ἀναβράσσοντος.*—**3.** מעלה] Qal is used of the steed in Je. 46^{9} 2 K. 9$^{33 (?)}$; Hiph. of the rider causing his horse to rear as here in Je. 51^{27}. 𝔊 *ἀναβαίνοντος*, treating it as Qal; so 𝔙. Gr. מִתְהַלֵּל. Oort$^{Em.}$ עֹלֶה. Rub., *v.* on v.^{1}.—לגויה] 𝔊 *τοῖς ἔθνεσιν αὐτῆς.* Du. לְגְוִית.—יכשלו] Rd. in impf. with Kt. (so 𝔖 𝔗), יִכְשְׁלוּ. This is better than the Qr. וְכָשְׁלוּ (so 𝔊, many Heb. mss., 𝔙), for this vb. contributes only a slight detail, not a new element in the scene.—בגויתם] Rd. בִּגְוִית, with Marti, Now.^{K}, Stk., Kau., Kent. ם is dittog. from foll. word. Oort$^{Em.}$ בגויתה. Hal. בְּעֲוֹנָם (*cf.* Ho. 14^{2}). Du. om. as a variant of לג׳.—**4.** מרב ז׳] 𝔊 joins to v.^{3}.—זונה] Du. om. as due to dittog..—טובת חן] 𝔊 *καλὴ καὶ ἐπιχαρής.* 𝔙 *speciosae et gratae.*—בעלה] In cstr. with foll. noun to denote a characteristic; *cf.* 1^{2} Is. 41^{15}; Ges.$^{§ 128 s. u}$. 𝔊 *ἡγουμένη.*—המכרת] *Cf.* Fraenkel, *Aram. Fremdwörter*, 127. מ׳ never means "get control over," but always "sell" or "deliver over to another"; Est. 7^{4} Is. 50^{1} 52^{3} are no exceptions to the regular usage. 𝔖 *who nourishes.* Bu. (on Ct. 1^{4}), הַמְּשַׁכֶּרֶת; so Marti, Now.^{K} (?), Stk., Kau., Kent.—**5.** י׳ צבאות] 𝔊 inserts אלהי. Du. om. צ׳ as due to influence of 2^{14}.—וגליתי] 𝔖 *and I will throw back.*—שוליך] 𝔊 *τὰ ὀπίσω σου.* 𝔙 *pudenda tua;* so 𝔖.—על פניך] Du. om. as gloss derived from Je. 13^{26}.—מערך] Syn. with ערוה. Apocopated from מערה; *cf.* מען, from מענה.—**6.** שקצים] 𝔊 𝔖 sg.. Hap. om. as gloss upon ונבלתיך.—ונבלתיך] 𝔊 *κατὰ τὰς ἀκαθαρσίας σου*; hence Du. נִבְלָתֵךְ, which he treats as a variant of the foregoing מערך. *Cf.* Hpt. who om. as gloss. Hap. נְבֵלֹתַיִךְ, 'thy carcasses.'—כראי] Om. כ as dittog. of preceding כ; *cf.* 𝔊 *εἰς παράδειγμα* (so 𝔖 𝔙). *Cf. Meša Ins.*, l. 12, רית = רְאִית (*cf.* גֵּוָה for גאוה); *cf.* רַאֲוָה, Ez. 28^{17}. Praetorius (*ZDMG.* LX, 402) would correct Meša's רית to בקרית, explaining the loss of בק as due to the preceding word מהקר and translating, "I destroyed all the people from the city, in Qeryyoth, for Chemosh and for Moab." But Qeryyoth is out of place here, the idiom הרג לְ is harsh, and the ordinary interpretation is easy and natural. For the same thought, *v.* Sachau's Assuan Papyri, I, 15 *f.*.—**7.** ראיך] Note assonance with ראי.—ידוד] On form, Ges.$^{\S 67\,cc}$. 𝔊 *καταβήσεται.* Σ *ἀναχωρήσει.* 𝔙 *resiliet.*—שָׁדְּדָה] For שָׁדְדָה; *cf.* מְאָדָּם, 2^{4}. Ges.$^{\S 52\,q}$. 𝔊 *δειλαία.*—לה] 𝔖 𝔙 𝔗 = לך; so many Heb. mss. and Gr..—מנחמים] 𝔊 *παράκλησιν.* 𝔙 *consolatorem;* so 𝔖. *Cf.* Jb. 2^{11} Is. 51^{19} for a similar parallelism with ינוד.—לך] Rd. לה, with 𝔊 *αὐτῇ*; so Rub. (*JQR.* XI, 459), Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, Marti, Now.$^{\text{K}}$, Stk., Kau., Du.. **8.** התיטבי מנא אמון] A confusion in the vb. of Qal and Hiph. forms; best pointed as Qal, הֲתִיטְבִי (*cf.* Ges.$^{\S 70\,e}$). נא אמ׳ is abbreviated to נא in Ez. $30^{14\text{-}16}$, and apparently transposed in Je. 46^{25}, אמון מִנֹּא (𝔊 *τὸν Ἀμμὼν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς*). 𝔊 in Ez. $30^{14\text{-}16}$ identifies נא as Thebes, viz. *Διόσπολις.* The Assy. reproduces it as *al Ni'i* (*cf.* Dl. *Paradies*, 318 *ff.*); this and the Heb. נא represent the Egyptian *nt* (with the *t* elided as is common) = 'town,' which was probably vocalised as *ne*(*t*). Hence, the name means "the town of Amon." In contemporary Egyptian records, Thebes was commonly designated as "the town," *par excellence; v.* Steindorff, *BAS.* I, 597; W. Max Müller, *EB.* 3427. Other cases where Assy. 'e' or 'i' corresponds to Heb. 'o' are listed by Hpt., viz. ראשׁ = *rešu;* אֵסַרְחַדּוֹן = Ašur-aḫa-iddina; צאֹן = *ṣenu;* יאֹכַל = *ekul;* סרגון = *Šarru-kenu.* The Vrss. vary. 𝔊 *ἑτοίμασαι μερίδα, ἅρμοσαι χορδήν, ἑτοίμασαι μερίδα Ἀμμών;* a composite rendering combining two variants, in which the vb. is read as a Hiph. imv. and מנא as מני = מנה. Some mss. of 𝔊 *ἅρμοσαι* (or *ἅρμοσον*) *χορδὴν μερὶς Ἀμμών.* 𝔖 *Art thou better than Javan of Ammon?* 𝔙 *numquid es melior Alexandria populorum;* so 𝔗. Aq. Σ Θ = מִן א׳; so Hap..—יארים] *Pl. majest.*, like נהרות, Ps. 137^{1} (so Hpt.); this is better than "Nile-streams" as ordinarily taken.—אשר] Du. om., as also יָם.—חיל] Rd. חֵילָהּ; so We., Or., Now., Rub. (*l. c.*), Bu. (*EB.* 3262), Hal., Hap., Marti, van H., Stk., Kau., Kent. Du. חֵילֶיהָ.—מַיִם] Rd. וּמַיִם, with 𝔊 *καὶ ὕδωρ*; so 𝔖 𝔙, some Heb. mss., and We., Gr., Rub. (*l. c.*), Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, Or., Dav., Now., Bu., Hal., Hap., Marti, Hpt., Dr., Stk., Kau., Du..—חומתה] 𝔊 = חוֹמֹתֶיהָ.—**9.** כוש] 𝔊 *καὶ Αἰθιοπία.*—עצמה] Rd. עָצְמָהּ, with 𝔊 *ἰσχὺς αὐτῆς*; so 𝔖 𝔙 𝔗 and Stei., Or., Rub. (*l. c.*), Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, Now., Hal., Marti, van H., Kau., Stk., Kent.—פוט] 𝔊 *τῆς φυγῆς* = פוּץ (Schleus.) or פלט (Reinke, Stek.). 𝔙 *Africa.* Marti, לְפוּט, connecting it with אין ק׳ as in 𝔊. Hap. לפליטה, om. קצה as a later correction. Du. ופוט.—לובים] One ms. of de R., לודים.—בעזרתך] Rd. בְּעֶזְרָתָהּ, with

𝔊 *βοηθοὶ αὐτῆς*; so 𝔖 and Stei., Gr., We., Oort$^{Em.}$, Or., Now., Marti, Dr., Hpt., van H., Stk., Kau., Kent, Du.. ב is *Beth essentiae* as in Ex. 18^4 Dt. 33^{26}, where it is likewise used with עז׳.—**10.** היא] Du. הָיְתָה.—בשבי] 𝔊 *αἰχμάλωτος*. 𝔖 om..—ירטשו] 𝔊 *ἐδαφιοῦσιν*; *cf.* Ho. 10^{14}. Gr. רֻטְּשׁוּ; so We., Now., Marti, Hpt., van H., Stk., Du.. But the change is unnecessary; a vivid impf. lends variety to the description.—הוצות] 𝔊 adds ־ֶיהָ; so 𝔖.—ועל נִכְבַּדֶּיהָ] 𝔊 = ועל־כל־נ׳; so Stk., Du.. On d. f. in ר *cf.* Ges.$^{§\ 93\ pp}$.—יַדּוּ] Also Ob.^{11} Jo. 4^3. Pf., √ ידד, a by-form of ידה. Accent probably due to rhythm. Gr. יָרוּ.—וכל־ג׳] Marti om. כל; so Hpt.. Du. suggests the insertion of גם.—רתקו] Only in Qr. of Ec. 12^6, where text is doubtful. Noun-forms occur in 1 K. 6^{21} Ez. 7^{23} Is. 40^{19}, but afford little help, partly because of textual corruption. The foll. word here points clearly to the desired meaning.—זִקִּים] Connected with Assy. *sinḳu* from *sanaḳu*, 'bind fast' (Zimmern, *KAT.*^{3}, 650). ז is, perhaps, due to influence of נ in זִנְקִים = זִקִּים, like זמן, 'time' = Assy. *simânu* (Hpt.).—**11.** גם] Twice in this verse, apparently to balance the double occurrence in v. ^{10}.—תשכרי] 𝔖 ܬܕܘܝܢ ('unhappy'), probably an error for ܬܪܘܝܢ ('be drunken'). Du. תִּשָּׁבְרִי.—תהי] An inexplicable jussive; *cf.* Dr.$^{§\ 170\ ff.}$. There is scarcely any basis for the rendering "mayest thou be" (BDB. *s. v.* עלם). For the use of the impf. plus the prtc. to express a continuing condition, *v.* Dr.$^{§\ 135.\ 5}$.—נעלמה] An exact parallel of this idiom is cited from Ar. by Hpt., viz. *gušiya ʿalayhi*, lit. "a cover was put upon him," *i. e.* he swooned. 𝔊 *ὑπερεωραμένη*; so 𝔖 𝔙. Gr. נֶעֱלָפָה (so Dr. (?), Du.) or מתעלפה.—מעוז] May be derived either from עוז or עזז; taken by the Massoretes from the latter, *e. g.* מָעֻזִּי, except in 2 S. 22^{33}, מָעוּזִּי. Probably 𝔐 confuses two words from these two roots; *cf.* Sta.$^{§\ 269\ e}$ and Brockelmann, *Vergl. Gram.* § 195. Here and in 1^7, it is better connected with עוז, 'seek refuge'; *contra* Hpt.. 𝔊 *στάσιν*. 𝔙 *auxilium*. Gr. מנוס (?).—מאיב] 𝔊 pl.. 𝔖 Θ = מאיבך.—**12.** תאנים] 𝔖 = בת׳.—עם] Rd. עַמֵּךְ, following Bu.'s suggestion of עִמָּם (on Ct. 4^{13}); so Marti, Now.^{K}, Hpt., Kent. כ being very close to מ in form was dropped by haplography; *v.* on Mi. 1^2.—בכורים] 𝔊 *σκοπούς*; some mss. *καρπούς*. 𝔙 *cum grossis suis*.—**13.** עמך] Om., with Marti, as a misplaced correction of עִם in v. ^{12}; so Now.^{K} (?).—נשים] 𝔊 𝔖 𝔗 = כְּנ׳; so Hap.. Hpt. יְשִׁימוּ, 'they will destroy.'—פתוח] Du. om. as a corrupt variant of נפ׳.—ארצך] א׳ may be applied to the region under the control of a single town (*cf.* 1 S. $9^{4.\ 5}$) as Hap. maintains here; but even so the whole land might well be spoken of as belonging to Nineveh, the capital.—בריחיך] Mich. בְּרִיחַיִךְ, 'thy fugitives.'—**14.** באי בטיט] *Cf.* Assy. *ṭîṭa erêbu* (Hpt.), an exact equivalent in meaning. Gr. בּוֹסִי; so Now., van H., Stk.; *cf.* Zc. 10^5.—בחמר] 𝔊 *ἐν ἀχύροις*.—מלבן] Only in 2 S. 12^{31} (Qr.); in Je. 43^9, if text is correct, מ׳ has a wholly different sense. Hoffmann, *ZAW.* II, 53–72 (*cf.* Dr. *Heb. Text of Books of Samuel*, 226 *ff.*), has made the meaning 'brick-mould' almost certain, showing (1) that in post-Bib.

Heb. it designates primarily a brick-mould and then things of the same rectangular shape, *e. g.* door-frames; (2) that the same twofold usage characterises the Ar. and Syr. *milban*. The secondary meaning applies in Je. 43^{9}. The rendering brick-kiln' of the earlier translators is out of the question. Hap. suggests 'brick wall,' which is possible in Je. 43^{9} (though less suitable than 'court' or 'square'), but is usable here only if the Hiph. of ה׳ be changed to a Pi'el, yielding 'repair the wall.' 𝔊 *ὑπὲρ πλίνθον* = מִלְּבֵנָה. 𝔗 *thy building*. 𝔙 *laterem*. 𝔖 ܡܘܠܟܢܐ ('promise'), probably an error for ܡܠܒܢܐ ('brick-mould'); so Seb., foll. Bernstein. Hap. בלבנה.—**15.** שָׁם] Against temporal sense, *v.* note on Zp. 1^{14}. Hpt. גם or וגם.—תאכלך כילק] Gre. om. כ׳ and tr. כארבה to take its place. Du. and Kent om. כ׳ and connect ת׳ with preceding חרב as subj.. Riedel (*SK.* 1903, pp. 166 *f.*), תְּכַלֵּךְ כֵּילַפָּה (*cf.* Assy. *kallaptu*, 'battle-axe'); so Now.^{2}, Kau. (?). Hal. כָּלָה ת׳א׳.—התכבד] Rd. הִתְכַּבְּדִי, with some mss. of Kenn.; so We., Now.^{2}, Oort$^{\text{Em.}}$, Marti, van H., Stk.. 𝔊 *καὶ βαρυνθήσει*; 𝔊$^{\text{A}\aleph\text{Q}}$ *-θήσῃ*. 𝔖 *because thou hast increased*. Gre. והתכבדי. Gr. הִתְכַּבַּדְתְּ; so Hap.. Riedel (*l. c.*), הִכָּבֵד. Now.^{1} הִכָּבְדִי. Rub. (*JQR.* XI, 459) om. as variant. Van H. הִתְכַּבְּרִי. Hpt. הִתְרַבִּי.—התכבדי] 𝔊 om. this and foll. word (so Now., Hal.); but HP. 23, 62, 87, 91, 147, 310, 𝔖$^{\text{H}}$ and 𝔍 have *πληθύνθητ ιὼς βροῦχος*. 𝔖 *and hast become numerous*. Gre. om. as variant. Gr. הרבית. Rub. (*l. c.*) הִתְכַּבְּדוּ. Hap. הִתְרַבֵּית. Du. הִתְכַּבְּדִי.—ארבה] To be taken, with Dl.$^{\text{HWB. 126}}$, from ארב (*cf.* Assy. *âribu*, *êribu*, *êribû*, 'a swarm of locusts') with nominal affix, rather than from רבה, with א prosthetic. Du. joins כא׳ with first word of v. ^{16}.—**16.** הרבית] Rd. הַרְבִּי, with We., Now., GASm., Marti, Hal., Dr., Stk., Kau.; *cf.* New. הַרְבִּי אֶת. Some mss. of Kenn. הרביתי. Du. הַרְבּוֹת.—רכליך] 𝔊 *τὰς ἐμπορίας σου*. 𝔙 *negotiationes tuas*. Kre. רֹכְלַיִךְ, 'thy mercenaries.' Du. רִכְבֵךְ.—מכוכבי הש׳] Du. כְּגוֹבַי הַזָּמָר.—ילק] Gr. כילק. Ges. (*Thesaurus*) *et al.* connect with לקק, 'to lap, lick'; but Hpt.'s proposal to ally it with Ar. *walaqa*, which denotes a 'leaping gait' of the camel, seems better; י׳ thus becomes 'the leaper.'—פשט] 𝔊 *ὥρμησεν*. Rub. (*JQR.* XI, 459), כָּשֹׁשׁ, 'anointer.' Gr. עָט, 'flying.'—ויעף] 𝔊 *ἐξεπετάσθη*. Rub. (*l. c.*), וְיָשֵׁף, 'and conjurer.' Van H. וְיָעִיף.—**17.** מִנְּזָרַיִךְ] D. f. *dirimens*; Ges.$^{\S\,20\,\text{h}}$. We. connects with מַמְזֵר, 'bastard,' as a by-form; but there is no basis in the parallel terms רכל and טפסר for supposing any contemptuous epithet here. Nor is there any analogy in Heb. for the interchange of מ and נ, even though Eth. does yield *manzer*. Hpt. explains it as prtc. Pi'el of Assy. *nazâru*, 'to curse, execrate,' viz. מְנַזְּרַיִךְ, 'thy exorcists.' Zimmern connects it with Assy. *maṣṣaru* = *manzaru*, 'guard'; but we should not expect such a Babylonian spelling in Nahum. The rendering given above makes no attempt to be specific, but is based upon the general sense of the Heb. נזר and upon the well-known predominance of the temple hierarchies in Assy.. 𝔙 *custodes tui*. 𝔖 *thy Nazirites* (or *consecrated ones*). 𝔊's ἐξήλατο seems to be a second rendering of ויעף (v. ^{16}), מ׳ being passed over in silence as unknown (Stek.). Rub. (*l. c.*) מִנְדְּרַיִךְ, 'thy measuring-clerks' (an Assy. loan-word, otherwise unknown). Gr. רוֹזְנַיִךְ, 'thy princes.' Hap. נתר מערבך, 'thy mixed multitude starts up in terror.' Kö. II, i, 90 מְנֻזָּרַיִךְ; so Dr.(?).—וְטַפְסְרַיִךְ] The pointing טִפְ׳ in Je. 51^{27} is only a dialectal variation; the more normal pointing, if related to Assy. *dupšarru*, would be טְפְ׳. Nö. *ZDMG.* XL, 732, declares the relation to *dupšarru* suitable here, but wholly unsuited to Je. 51^{27}. This latter view is certainly justifiable, if the word must be confined to the narrow sense of 'scribe'; but this is unnecessary in view of the Heb. analogies and of the influential position of the *dupšarru* in the Tel-el-Amarna letters (*v. s.*); *cf.* Dl. *Hebrew Language*, 13. For the interchange of 'd' and 't', *cf.* the Sabaean טף, 'tablet,' in Glaser, 1053 (*v.* Hommel, *Aufsätze und Abhandlungen*, 141; Zimmern, *KAT.*^{3}, 400). 𝔊 *ὁ συμμικτός σου*, perhaps, like 𝔙's *et parvuli tui*, based upon the first syllable טף, the remainder being unknown. 𝔖 *and those that strive for thee.* Hap. om. as gloss. Hpt. וְטִפְסְרַיִךְ.—כגוב גובי] Rd. כגובי, om. גוב as dittog. with 𝔊, *ὡς ἀκρίς*; so 𝔖 and Gre., New., We., Dav.(?), Rub., Now., Hap., Marti, Hal., Dr., van H., Stk., Kau.. Hpt. om. גובי. Gr. גוב כגובי. גוב is ἅπ.; taken by the earlier comm. as an intensive genitive, meaning 'the great locust'; so Or.. On root-meaning of גובי, *v.* H.$^{AH.\ 162}$; *cf.* Barth, *NB.*$^{\S 3b}$. Brockelmann, *Vergl. Gram.* I, p. 412, derives it from the related root גוב, with the nominal affix ־ַי.—החונים] 𝔊 *ἐπιβεβηκυῖα.* Gr. הַחוֹנֶה; so Du..—ביום קרה] We. בְּקֹר הַיּוֹם(?); so Hpt.. But this change is unnecessary; the phrase recurs in Pr. 25^{20}. It means not merely 'in the cool of the day,' but 'on a cold day' or 'in cold weather.'—כגדרות] 𝔊 sg..—ונודד ולא] Now. וְנִדֲּדוּ לֹא; so Hap., Marti, van H., Stk., Kau.; *cf.* We.. Hpt. om. as gloss. The form is Po. pf. active; *cf.* Sta. $^{\S 155e}$. The change to pl. is unnecessary; the sg. of גובי , ארבה , ילק, the collective nouns, prevails over the pl. prtc. which is not in close proximity. —נודע] 𝔊 *ἔγνω.*—מקומו] Now. מְקוֹמָם; so Hap. *et al.*.—אים] Rd. אֵיךְ, with Du., and tr. to beginning of v. ^{18}. For confusion of כ and ם, *v.* on Mi. 2^{1}. For איך with the pf., *v.* 2 S. 1^{19} Je. 2^{21} 9^{18}; *cf.* איכה, La. 1^{1} 2^{1} $4^{1.\,2}$. 𝔊 *οὐαὶ αὐτοῖς.* Arn. om. as gloss; so Hap., Hpt.. Gr. אֵיהוּ; so Hal.. Marti, אוי לָךְ; so Now.^{K}, Stk., Kent.—**18.** נמו] 𝔊 *ἐνύσταξαν.* *CB.* נָסוּ.—רעיך] Rd. this and the foll. suffixes in the fem., since the address thus far has been to the city of Nineveh; so Arn., Marti, Hap., Now.^{K}, Hpt., Stk., Kau., Kent.—ישכנו] Rd. יָשְׁבוּ; so We., Oort, GASm., Hal., Dr., Hpt., Stk., Kent, Du.. 𝔊 *ἐκοίμισεν*, with 'king of Assy.' as its subj.. 𝔊 is so awkward here that Hap. shrewdly surmises that 'king of Assy.' was inserted later into its text, the original rendering having been something like *ἐκοιμήθησαν οἱ δυνάσται σου.* Κοιμίζω is usually the equivalent of some form of שכב, which is also rendered much more frequently by the related vb. *κοιμάω.* In Ju. 16^{19}, however, *κοιμάζω* represents the Pi'el of

ישן and *κοιμάω* renders the same vb. several times. On the whole, preference here must be given to ישן. The impf. ישכנו between the two pfs. is in any case unusual.—אדיריך] 𝕾 *thy neighbours*.—נפשו] Rd. נָפֹצוּ; so Gr., BDB., Hal., Dr., Now.^{K}, Hpt., Stk., Kau.. 𝕲 *ἀπῆρεν*. 𝖁 *latitavit*. נפשו is *ἅπ*.; connection with פוש, 'skip about,' is possible, but hardly suitable in this context. Syr. and Aram. פוש, 'remain behind,' is little better. *Cf.* 1 K. 22^{17}.—**19.** כהה] Rd. גֵּהָה, with 𝕲, *ἴασις*; so We., Dr., Now.^{K}, Hpt., Kau.. 𝕾 *one who grieves*; so 𝕿. 𝖁 *obscura*. כ' is *ἅπ*.; the only meanings obtainable from this root are 'dimness' and 'quenching,' neither of which is applicable to a wound (*contra* van H.). For ג', *v.* Pr. 17^{22} and, as a vb., Ho. 5^{13}.—נחלה] 𝕲 *ἐφλέγμανεν*.—תמיד] 𝕲 *διὰ παντός*.—Attempts have been made to improve upon the order of vv. $^{11-19}$; *e. g.* Hpt., $^{11.\ 14.\ 15b.\ 15a.\ 12.\ 13.\ 18.\ 19}$; Stk. $^{11.\ 13.\ 14b.\ 14a.\ 12.\ 16.\ 15a.\ 17-19}$; while Du. would place ^{19a} between ^{15a} and ^{15b} and drop ^{17a} as a gloss. The improvement is hard to discover. For example, ^{14} follows ^{11} no better than ^{12} does, while the fact that both mention מבצריך is a very insufficient reason for bringing ^{12} and ^{14} into juxtaposition. 𝕸's position for ^{19a} could not well be improved, constituting as it does a proper climax.

INDEXES TO MICAH, ZEPHANIAH AND NAHUM.

I. INDEX OF HEBREW WORDS.

אִתִּים, 88.
אתנן, 40.

בליעל, 308.

גרם, 244.

דלג, 208.

הֻצַּב, 331.

חרול, 230.

טפסר, 352, 359.
טֶרֶם, 222.

יַחְדָּיו, 39.

כ and מ confused, 34, 115, 139, 153, 192, 262, 330, 357, 359.
כבס, 156.
כְּמָרִים, 192.
כסף, 222.
כְּשָׁפִים, 117.

לחם, 210.

מ and כ confused, 300 *f.*
מִיכָה, 31.
מלבן, 357 *f.*
ממשק, 230.
מנזרים, 351, 358 *f.*
מפתן, 208 *f.*
מקום, 40.

נחום, 285 *f.*
נטר, 297.

סָפּוּר, 51

עמדה, 51.
עפל, 96.
ערפל, 210.
עתר, 254.

פלדת, 314, 329.

צִירָה, 69.
צפניה, 184.

הֵן, 224.
קשש, 221.

רחבות, 329 *f.*
רעל, 329.
רתם, 51.

שארית, 69, 112.
שִׁטִּים, 123.
שמרים, 210.

II. INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

Achzib, 48.
Acrostic, 295 *ff.*, 306, 309, 327.
Adullam, 49.
Apocalypse of Zephaniah, 166.
Ashdod, 216.
Asherim, 114 *f.*
Ashurbanipal, 159 *ff.*, 344.
Assonance, 113, 210, 215, 224, 298, 328, 332.
Assuan Papyri, 51, 68, 84, 86, 93, 96, 189, 192, 245, 356.
Assyria, 107, 108, 159 *ff.*, 277, 337 *f.*
Assyrian inscriptions, 115, 184, 192, 201, 205, 215, 245, 312, 317, 323, 330, 336, 339, 344 *ff.*, 347, 349, 352 *f.*
Atheism, 202.

Baalism, 186 *f.*
Babylon, 92.
Babylonian inscriptions, 337.
Baca, 45.
Beth Ephrathah, 102.
Bethlehem, 103.

Captives, treatment of, 38, 339.
Coinage, 200 *f.*
Crete, 216 *ff.*
Criticism, of Micah, 9–16; of Nahum, 268 *ff.*; of Zephaniah, 172 *f.*
Cruelty, 335 *f.*
Cyaxares, 163, 170, 276.

Day of Yahweh, 24, 142, 169, 179, 194 *f.*
Diaspora, 110, 150.
Dirge, 41, 58, 64.
Dittography, 5, 42, 43, 44, 51, 54, 55, 65, 66, 67, 102, 119, 130, 149, 192, 210, 218, 236, 254, 294, 307, 328, 355, 356, 359.

Elkoshite, 286 *f.*
Ethiopia, 232, 343 *f.*
Excavations, 205, 319, 348 *f.*

Faith, 68.

Gates, of Jerusalem, 198 *f.*; of the land, 347; of the rivers, 318 *f.*, 330 *f.*
Gath, 45, 50, 216.
Genealogy, 182 *f.*
Gilgal, 123.

Hammurabi, code of, 52, 143.
Haplography, 5, 108, 357.
Hendiadys, 63.
Herodotus, 162 *f.*, 170 *f.*, 206, 216, 277, 335.
Holiness Code, 125.
Huldah, 169.
Human sacrifice, 126.

Jackals, 38.
Jericho, 205.
Jerusalem, destruction of, 25.
Josephus, 200, 313.

Lachish, 46.
Locust, 350, 352.

Manasseh, 124, 126, 161 *f.*
Mareshah, 49, 52.
Maroth, 46, 51.
Maṣṣeboth, 114, 115.
Messiah, 104, 108.
Milcom, 189 *f.*
Moab, 225 *f.*
Moabite Stone, 95, 96, 215, 356.
Monotheism, 179 *f.*
Moresheth, 17, 48.
Mourning customs, 100.

NABONIDUS, 164.
Name, power of divine, 248.
Necho, 165.
Nimrod, 109.
Nineveh, 163 *f.*, 274 *ff.*, 318 *ff.*
No-Amon, 340 *f.*

OPHRAH, 50.

PHAESTOS Disk, 217.
Philistines, 216 *f.*
Poetic form, of Micah, 6 *ff.*; of Nahum, 270 *ff.*; of Zephaniah, 174 *ff.*
Political parties, 21.
Priestly Code, 125.
Puns, 42.
Put, 249, 343 *f.*

Qîna, 53, 145, 151, 229, 235.

REMNANT, 111.
Righteousness, 214.

SALT-PITS, 227.
Samaria, fall of, 20, 37, 39.
Scythians, 162 *f.*, 169 *ff.*, 178, 230, 232, 276.
Shamash-shum-ukin, 160 *f.*, 275.
Shaphir, 45.
Shear Jashub, 105.
Sinjirli, inscriptions of, 215.
Sun-worship, 188.
Superscriptions, 19, 30 *f.*, 284 *f.*

TAHARKA, 159.
Thebes, 159 *ff.*, 274, 276, 340 *ff.*, 356.
Thomas of Celano, 204.
Threshold, 197 *f.*

UMMAN-MANDA, 164.
Urartu, 194, 220.

WATER supply of Nineveh, 348.
Weights and measures, 133.

XENOPHON, 165, 235, 348.

ZAANAN, 46

A
CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY

ON

HABAKKUK

BY

WILLIAM HAYES WARD, D.D., LL.D.

INTRODUCTION.

AUTHORSHIP AND DATE.

History and tradition give us no reliable facts as to the personality or age of Habakkuk, so that we are left entirely to internal evidence for our conclusions. Peiser, *MVAG.*, viii, p. 5 *sq.* connects his name with Assyrian *hambakuku*, name of a garden plant, and finds in his use of words in 2^2 evidence that he was trained at Nineveh in Assyrian learning, perhaps a captive prince; but this is pure imagination. We only know that the book, substantially as we have it, was composed or compiled early enough to form a part of the second collection of sacred writings, called *The Prophets*, and that it antedated the editing of the Hagiographa. The third chapter is indicated by its title and its colophon, as well as by its character and by a passage duplicated in Ps. 77, to be a psalm, perhaps taken from a psalm-book, and does not appear to be genetically connected with the first two chapters, although assigned by the editor to the same author. The use of אלוה in 3^3 and of משיח for Israel in 3^{13}, and the almost total loss of the article, are mentioned by Budde as proofs of a late origin. The chief difficulty in the study of Habakkuk is found in the question, Who are the "wrong-doers," the בוגדים against whom the prophecy is directed? It is distinctly stated in 1^{5-11} that the Chaldeans will be summoned as Yahweh's ministers of correction. This puts the date of this passage at a time shortly before the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, and in the reign of Jehoiakim. No other date can be given to these verses, unless 1^{2-11} be regarded as a dramatic representation of an earlier divine interposition for punishment. But just as plainly 1^{12}–2^{20} was written after the capture of Jerusalem, while the Jews were under the yoke of a foreign oppressor. In 1^5 the בוגדים were to be punished by the coming of the Chaldeans; in 1^{13} they are the foreign and idolatrous oppressors themselves.

This inconsistency has led some scholars, as Giesebrecht and Wellhausen, to throw out 1^{5-11} as an earlier prophetic fragment which has been intruded here; while Budde puts it after 2^{4}. Ewald regards the present order as correct and the text genuine up to 2^{8}. Budde offers a curious explanation, supposing that Habakkuk's prophecy is directed against the Assyrians of Josiah's time, who are about to be punished by the Babylonians.

The language of complaint in 1^{1-4} makes no mention of a foreign invader. There are people guilty of חמס *violence*, און *wrong*, עמל *trouble*, שד *pillage*, ריב *strife*, and מדון *contention*. As a result the תורה *Law* is paralysed and משפט *justice* fails. It is in this way that native oppression and not a foreign invader would be described. Then follows in vv. $^{5-11}$ a description of the Chaldeans whose invasion would be a punishment for such sins. The transition from the complaint of the prophet to Yahweh's answer is not unusually abrupt, although the latter has no such formal introduction as in 2^{2}. Yahweh's answer is addressed to the בוגדים (בגוים) who *will not believe* it, an expression naturally applicable to those who have some faith in Yahweh. In v. ^{6} the Chaldeans are about to be raised up; but they are well known and well characterised. They have been in the habit of gathering captives (v. ^{9}) and conquering cities (v. ^{10}). There is no internal reason for separating vv. $^{5-11}$ from vv. $^{1-4}$. The crimes of the wicked Jews (vv. $^{2.\,3}$) are to be punished by the impending attack of the Chaldeans (v. ^{6}). The time is between the battle of Carchemish, 605 B.C., and the first Captivity, 597 B.C., and so about 600 B.C., or during the reign of Jehoiakim, unless (Kuenen) we take vv. $^{1-11}$ as written after the event dramatically described as future. Thus far nothing implies a condition of captivity.

Date

In 1^{12-17} the condition changes. The oppressions of the wicked Jews are forgotten, and the complaint is against the invader, who gathers captives like fishes in a net. This must have been written after the first Captivity. Were the last half of v. ^{12} genuine it would closely connect the second complaint with the preceding v. ^{11}; but it is out of place, answering a question asked in the next

ote
hange

verse. The אלהי *my God* of v.[12], however, seems to refer back to the אלהו *his god* of v.[11] by way of contrast; and the עמל *wrong*, רשע *wicked*, צדיק *righteous*, and בוגדים *evil-doers* of v.[13] seem an echo of corresponding words in vv.[3-5]; and the sacrifices of v.[16] seem to refer to the sacrifices which an emendation finds in v.[11]. But the *wicked one* of vv.[14-17] is a foreign invader, a different person from the wicked one of vv.[1-4].

In the reply of Yahweh (2[2-8]) a foreign foe is described, such as the Assyrian power, or the Babylonian kingdom of Nebuchadnezzar. A single clause, "All the rest of the peoples shall spoil thee," brings a slight support to Budde's theory that we have here a prophecy of the overthrow of the Assyrians, inasmuch as it was by such a league that the Assyrian power was destroyed. Vv.[2. 3] have not a poetic form; the vision written on a tablet, therefore, began with v.[4] and seems to continue through v.[8], embracing the first malediction. The "parable" of v.[6] is found in the description (vv.[6. 7]) of the Babylonian power under the figure of a usurer; the "interpretation" מליצה, which was to be inexplicable to him, חידות "a riddle," is found in v.[8] as a definite prophecy of ruin.

The data given above strictly interpreted would make it appear that 1[1-11], containing the first complaint and Yahweh's answer, belongs to the period of Jehoiakim. With v.[11] begins a second complaint, with Yahweh's answer, modelled on or closely related to the earlier prophecy, and copying its expressions, but referring to a later period during the Captivity, while the Babylonian power was approaching its fall. There is thus no need of dislocating the order of the verses by dropping 1[5-11], and uniting the two complaints into one.

It is possible to escape the conclusion that we have here a composite by two authors of different dates, by assuming a dramatic form to these chapters. It is not impossible that the prophet, considering the evils of his own day, discovers the occasion for them in the divine retribution for the sins of the people. He thus defends the justice of God in bringing the Jews into captivity, because of the oppression and disregard of the Law by his ancestors; but now he appeals to Yahweh against the new oppressors. This possible view gives us two scenes in the drama: the one (1^{2-11}) retrospective and introductory, while the other (1^{12}–2^{8}) pleads against the continuance of the present distress.

So long as the word *Chaldean* (v. ^{6}) remains unchallenged we are compelled to refer this section to the period of the Captivity. It is by a very hazardous conjecture that Duhm makes the prophet refer to the coming invasion of Alexander. To do this he has changed כשדים *Chaldeans* to כתיים *Greeks*, and in 1^{9} he changes מגמת to מגמר and translates, *From Gomer their direction is eastward*, and finds thus an absolute proof that this was no Chaldean invasion. While Duhm may be right in assuming but one writer, his textual evidence is inconclusive as to date.

The first of the five maledictions of ch. 2 is closely connected with Yahweh's preceding answer. The second malediction has no logical connection with the first, but is closely connected with the third, which contains the utterance of the אבן *stone* and the כפים *brace* (v.^{11}). But the third contains three quotations, two of them direct, from Mi. 8^{10} Je. 51^{58} and Is. 11^{9}. This probably brings down the date of both the second and third maledictions nearly or quite to the Maccabean period; and to a similar date we may assign the fourth and fifth maledictions.

The third chapter is a separate production, arranged for temple worship, and may or may not be by one of the authors to whom we owe 1^{12}–2^{20}. It belongs to a troubled period following the Captivity but contains no definite indications of its age beyond its quotations. It takes v. ^{3} from Dt. 33^{2}; and v. ^{19} is based on 2 S. 22^{34} (Ps. 18^{33}), which in turn is taken from Dt. 33^{29}. Vv. $^{10.\ 11.\ 15}$ have a close relation with Ps. 77^{17-20}; but here the psalm is the later production. In Habakkuk these lines are in couplets; in Ps. 77 a third line has been added to each couplet, and the fragment differs in this triple structure from the rest of the psalm. In Habakkuk they belong to a song of vengeance; in Ps. 77 to a song of reminiscent triumph. In Habakkuk there is no reference to past history; while in Ps. 77 these verses are inserted in the midst of an account of the victories of the Exodus.

Logically 3^{15} should follow v. ^{11}, precisely as in Ps. 77 v. ^{20} follows v. ^{19}. Either vv. $^{12-14}$ are a later insertion, or v. ^{15} should precede them.

TOPICAL ANALYSIS.

The Oracle begins with the complaint of Israel personated by the prophet, occupying 1^{1-4}; followed by the response of Yahweh, embracing vv. $^{5-11}$. In these eleven verses the wrong-doer is to be punished by the invasion of the Chaldeans, and therefore he is the wicked Jewish court and princes. This puts the date about 600 B.C., in the reign of Jehoiakim. With v. ^{12} begins a second complaint against the foreign heathen oppressor, here necessarily the Babylonians themselves, concluding with 2^1. This must be later than the time of Jehoiakim, as the Babylonians have now made their invasion. Yahweh's response begins with v. ^{2}; and this and v. ^{3} announce the vision to be fulfilled at a later period. It is to be preserved legibly written on clay tablets of the Babylonian style, and consists of two parts, one about the preservation of the righteous, and the other the overthrow of the wicked oppressor. The prophet has not made it quite clear where the inscribed *vision* ends. Indeed he seems to have continued the last part, that about the wrong-doer, into the first malediction. The second and third maledictions are too closely connected together to be separated; but the third contains three quotations from as many other prophets, and must therefore be later than the first malediction; and the fourth and fifth also seem to belong to a period considerably later than the Babylonian Captivity.

The third chapter is intended for musical recitation in the temple worship, and may well be of the period of the last part of the second chapter. Being assigned to Habakkuk, we may presume that Habakkuk was the last compiler and editor of the first two chapters, and may have been the author of the last part of the second chapter.

It is impossible in translation to reproduce the abounding alliterations of the original, or the prevailing poetic measure, consisting of three principal words in a line.

COMMENTARY.

THE ORACLE.

1[1]. *The Oracle which Habakkuk the prophet did see.* This verse is probably a later editorial title.

THE COMPLAINT. 1[2-4].

[2]. How long, Yahweh, must I call, and thou hearest not,
Must I cry to thee, "Violence"! and thou savest not?
[3]. Why dost thou show me wretchedness and trouble?
And pillage and violence are before me;
And there is strife, and contention ariseth.
[4]. Therefore the law is benumbed,
And judgment goeth forth no more.
[For the wicked circumventeth the righteous; therefore justice goeth forth perverted.]

2–4. The conditions in these verses are plainly not those of war, but of domestic oppression. The *law* in v. [4] is not the *Torah*, but the religious institutions, corresponding to *justice* in the next line. When coupled with עמל, און means *trouble*. The latter part of v. [4] is not rhythmic, and is a marginal gloss. It is meant to elucidate the second member of the couplet, but it is a weak statement that the perversion of justice consists in circumventing the righteous.

THE RESPONSE. 1[5-11].

[5]. Look, ye wrong-doers, and behold, and be greatly amazed; for I am about to do a work in your days which ye will not believe though it be told you. [6]. For,

Behold I raise up the Chaldeans,
That violent and vehement nation,
Which marcheth along the far regions of the earth
To hold the homes that are not his.
[7]. Dreadful and terrible is he;
From him judgment goeth forth.

[8]. And swifter than leopards are his horses,
And fiercer than evening wolves.
And his horsemen spread from afar;
And they fly like an eagle eager for food.
[9]. All his host is bent on violence,
[Untranslatable intrusion]
And he gathereth his captives like sand.
[10]. And he it is that scoffeth at kings,
And rulers are his derision.
He it is that derideth every fortress,
And he heapeth up earth and taketh it.
[11]. Then his purpose changeth and he passeth along,
And setteth up his altar to his god.

5. This verse introduces the rhythmical response which follows. The corrupt *Among the nations* is easily corrected to *wrong-doers* as in v. [13]. Their *amazement* implies that the oppressive rulers in the time of Jehoiakim depended on Egypt to protect them against the Chaldeans.—**7.** By omitting the word *dignity* (RV.) we keep both the thought and the trimeter measure. The meaning is that they are a self-willed, ambitious people, who pay no respect to *justice*, rights ordinarily accepted, but do as they please.—**8.** The third member must be emended by eliminating the repeated *horsemen*, but even so the translation is not clear. —**9.** The second member must be given up as untranslatable. It is a corrupt intrusion; or, possibly, represents the remnant of a member of a lost couplet.—**10.** The emphatic position of the pronoun in both couplets must be observed in translation.

11. This verse has suffered much in transcription and was not understood by 𝔊, and RV. gives the reader the choice of several translations. The clause "and is guilty" is weak and meaningless. If we transfer the Hebrew word to the second member, as we must, the present text of the first member must read, as in RV., *Thus shall he sweep by as a wind and pass over*, which gives a fair sense. But we had better follow a number of mss. which are of great value in ch. 3 and read *his spirit* in place of *wind*. We then have the statement that the Chaldean, having accomplished one siege, turns to a new purpose, as we were told in v. [7] that *his judgment goeth forth from himself*. *Cf.* Jb. 9[11] Ct. 2[11] for the similar use of the verb. The second member gives no suitable meaning and is probably past reconstruction. It is most probable that the original text contained the word for *sacrifice* or *altar*, in place of *this his strength*, which requires the change of כ to ב. Of the two emendations suggested, the first retains אשָׂם, with the sense *he offers a propitiatory sacrifice to his god.* We learn from Nu. $31^{19.\ 24.\ 50}$ that after a battle the soldiers were ceremonially unclean, through having touched the dead, and offered sacrifices for purification. The same custom is referred to in 1 S. $15^{15.\ 21}$ where Saul saves Amalekite cattle *to sacrifice to Yahweh.* In rabbinic times everything was ceremonially lawful to an army in war, and they could even break the Sabbath or eat swine's flesh, and the Talmud is puzzled over the need of purification in Nu. 31. But it is preferable to change אשׂם to ישׂם and read *he setteth up his altar to his god.* The altar would not be *built*, but *set up*, as in war the king would use such a portable altar as is often figured on the monuments. The reading proposed assumes a second מ after ישׂם, just as in the first member a second ו is required for רוחו.

3. **𝕸** תביט **𝕲** *ἐπιβλέπειν ταλαιπωρίαν*, reading הביט שד. So **𝕬** and **𝕴** *videre prædam.* **𝕾** seems to read אביט. The text of **𝕸** requires a Hiph. sense which the word never has. It is redundant, suggested perhaps by v. ^{13}; *cf.* Nu. 23^{21}. **𝕸** ישא is superfluous, but was a necessary addition when מדון became מדין, **𝕲** *κριτής*, followed by **𝕬** and **𝕾**. The third member in this verse suggests that a fourth has been lost.—**4.** **𝕸** לנצח. The desired antithesis to מעקל in the early gloss which completes the verse has compelled Vrss. and com. to give נצח the impossible meaning of *sincerity*. So Ra., Ges., de W., Ew. Suggested emendations are לנכח and לנֻדה. **𝕸** מכתיר. **𝕲** *καταδυναστεύει.* We. suggests מכמיר; but in Ju. 20^{43} and Ps. 22^{13} כתר has the sense of assailing, or encompassing with purpose to destroy. מכרית would be too strong a word, as these are domestic enemies.

5. בגוים is to be corrected to בגדים; so **𝕲** **𝕾** and critics generally, after v. ^{13} and 2^{5}. **𝕸** והתמהו תמהו to be corrected after We., *et al.*, to והתמהמהו, *cf.* 2^{3}.—**6.** For מרחבי rd. מרחקי, after Is. 8^{9}.—**7.** **𝕸** inserts ושאתו, which injures the measure and obscures the contrast with ולא יצא לנצח משפט, *cf.* v. ^{4}. The Copt. omits it, probably following an earlier **𝕲**. For משפטו ושאתו rd. משפט ושֵׁאת, destruction, *cf.* La. 3^{47}.—**8.** **𝕸** inserts ופרשיו by dittog. before מרחוק, and then adds יבאו after it to provide a predicate. **𝕲** *καὶ ἐξιππάσονται οἱ ἱππεῖς καὶ ὁρμήσονται* *μακρόθεν*, probably omitting יבאו. Ew. and St. omit ופרשיו מרחוק יבאו as a gloss. Rd. ואפו for 𝔐 יאפו, 𝔊 *καὶ πετασθήσονται*. So 𝔖.—**9.** The clause inserted by 𝔐 מגמת פניהם קרימה, interrupts the parallel, lacks fitness and is apparently an untranslatable intrusion. 𝔊 could not translate it, *ἀνθεστηκότας προσώποις αὐτῶν ἐξ ἐναντίας*.—**11.** 𝔐 רוח, better רוחו. Several important mss. (HP., 62, 86, 147 and others) give *πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ*. 𝔐 ואשם זו כחו yields no reasonable sense and is corrupt. It is to be corrected by some form of the √ זבח such as ואשָׂם זָבח לאלהו or וַיָּשֶׂם מזבחו לאלהו, *cf.* v. ^{16}.

SECOND COMPLAINT. $1^{12\text{-}17}$.

[12]. Art not thou, Yahweh, from of old?
Thou, my God, my Holy One, diest not.
[Yahweh, for judgment hast thou appointed him,
And, O Rock, for reproof hast thou established him.]
[13]. Why dost thou look on the wrong-doers,
Art silent when the wicked consumeth the righteous?
[14]. And thou makest men like the fish of the sea,
Like swarms that have no ruler?
[15]. All of them he sweepeth into his net,
And gathereth them into his seine;
[Therefore he rejoiceth and is glad.]
[16]. Therefore he sacrificeth to his net,
And burneth incense to his seine;
For by them his portion is fat
And his food is dainty.
[17]. Shall he therefore ever empty his net,
And spare not to slay nations?

12. The parallelism requires *Thou diest not*, in place of the irrelevant *We shall not die*, of 𝔐. The second couplet is an intrusion quite out of place and anticipates the answer to the complaint which it interrupts. It was added to explain God's providence. So We.—**13.** 𝔐 has *The wicked consumeth him who is more righteous than himself*, instead of simply *the righteous*. It was an added gloss because it was not thought that one fully righteous could be swallowed up by the wicked.—**14.** The sense seems to be that God, who has a providence for men who serve him, appears to treat them no better than the lower animals to which he pays no attention, leaving them to the accidents and fates of nature. The thought is the reverse of that of Jesus, who declared the sparrows to be under God's care.—**15.** This verse has an extra member, omitted in a class of mss. and not needed. The omission of *lifteth with his hook* not only corrects the metre but relieves the figure, as the Chaldean army could hardly be compared to an angler with a hook. He catches them in *swarms* (v. ^{14}) and sacrifices to his net and seine (v. ^{16}).—**16.** It is not meant that the Chaldeans literally sacrificed and burnt incense to their net and seine. This simply carries on the figure. The sacrifice was to the gods of war such as Marduk and Adad and Ishtar.

THE WATCH FOR YAHWEH'S ANSWER. 2^{1}.

I will stand upon my post
And station myself on a tower;
And I will look out to see what he will say to me,
And what answer he will return to my complaint.

The response to the prophet's second complaint is more elaborate than that to the first complaint, and is more formally introduced. The first complaint was against native oppression, and the response threatened their punishment by the Chaldean conquest. The second complaint is against these Chaldean conquerors, and so is later, unless we may regard 1^{1-11} as a dramatic retrospect, explaining the subject condition of the Jewish people. One may prefer the reading *rock* to *tower*, following the Vrss., but the longer מצור is probably genuine and more musically matches משמרתי by the latent paronomasia which the prophet much affects.

12. 𝔐 נמות noted by Mas. as *tikkun sopherim.* 𝔗 interprets as לא תמות, so Ra., Ew., Kue., Nö., *et al.*—**13.** 𝔐 ממנו omitted by 𝔊 𝔖. For 𝔐 יסרתו 𝔊 rd. יסרתו, *καὶ ἔπλασέν με τοῦ ʼελέγχειν παιδείαν ἀυτοῦ*, giving צור the Aram. sense of form, fashion.—**14.** Rd. וְתעשׂה.—**15.** The irregular metre can be restored by the omission of בחכה העלה, which is inappropriate, as the Chaldean captures were wholesale, and there is no sacrifice to the *hook*. 𝔐 על כן ישמח ויגיל is omitted in mss. mentioned in v. ^{11}.—**17.** For 𝔐 העל כן Gie. and We. read העולם, but תמיד belongs to this member. For חרמו they read חרבו, as does Copt. and one ms. of 𝔊; but it is more poetic to continue the figure. 𝔐 ותמיד להרג. So 𝔊 𝔍, but 𝔖 divides the members after תמיד, omitting the conj. This makes two equal members, and allows לא יחמול to denote continuance, parallel to תמיד. We. changes 𝔐 יחמול to יחדל.

2[1]. 𝔐 מצור. 𝔊 πέτραν, so 𝔖, reading צור. 𝔐 אשיב. But the parallel requires ישיב. 𝔐 would mean, What answer I shall return to those who sent me, *cf.* 2 S. 24[13]; but there is no indication of the prophet's representative character. 𝔖, Brd., We., Oort, *et al.*, rd. ישיב.

YAHWEH'S DIRECTION. 2[2-3].

[2. 3]. And Yahweh answered me and said: "Write the vision and engrave it on tablets, that one may read it readily. For the vision is only for a set time, and is ripening toward its conclusion, and it will not fail. If it linger wait for it, for it will surely come; it will not delay. Behold:"

2. The *tablets* were like those of Babylonia, of clay, not of wax, and were to be preserved during the years that should elapse before the overthrow of the Babylonian power. They were to be written distinctly for public knowledge and encouragement. The use of tablets implies that the prophecy was written in Babylonia. It was a roll which Isaiah took in 8[1].—**3.** This verse and v. [4] are directed to the encouragement of the captive Jews in their patient assurance of the divine faithfulness. Budde makes כי, *for*, the sign of direct discourse, as in Is. 9[18, 20], and the oracle begin here. But this is not clear.

THE ORACLE. 2[4-5].

[4]. The upright [shall rest] his soul in me;
And the righteous shall live in my faithfulness.
[5]. And also:
As with wine the wrong-doer vaunteth,
He hath more than enough, but is not filled;
Who enlargeth his desire like Sheol,
And like Death he is not sated;
But gathereth to him all the nations,
And heapeth to him all the peoples.

We have in these verses a double consolation. In v. [4] the faithful righteous is told that he shall be preserved, because the God of Israel is faithful to his covenant; in v. [5] the thought turns to the oppressing nation which is to be visited with maledictions.

4. This verse is one of two which Paul depended on for the doctrine of justification by faith, following the meaning of the present Hebrew text, which should probably be corrected after 𝔊.

The first member of the verse gives no sense, but must have given a sense like that of the second member.

5. *And also* is not part of the poetic measure. The three couplets explain the occasion for the maledictions that follow, in the greed of the Chaldean ambition. The corrupt first couplet must be restored conjecturally. The word *wine*, which must be retained, gives the key to the emendation, and the first two couplets correspond to each other. The oppressor boasts like one filled with wine and still unsatisfied, and in the next couplet he is *like Death* who is ever greedy and never has food enough. There is here a partial quotation from Is. 5^{14}, *Therefore Sheol enlargeth her desire.*

3. 𝔐 ויפח, 𝔊 *ἀνατελεῖ*, 𝔍 *apparebit.* 𝔖 appears to have read ויבא הקץ. Seb. emends to יופיע. Brd., We. and Oort read ויפרח. Ehr. retains 𝔐 ויפח, but reads עֵד for 𝔐 עוד, and translates, *The vision shall bear witness for time to come, and proclaim to the end;* as עֵד and יָפֵחַ are thus connected in Ps. 27^{12} Pr. 6^{19} 12^{17} 14^{25} $19^{5.\,9}$, although mispointed יפיח in Pr. 𝔐 לא יאחר. 𝔊 𝔖 𝔍 𝔗 𝔄 and 40 mss. collated by Kenn. and de R. read ולא.—**4.** The first member of this couplet is corrupt past safe reconstruction. 𝔊 *ἐαν ὑποστείληται οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχή μου ἐν αὐτῷ*, reading הן יעלף and נפשי. 𝔍 *Ecce qui incredulus est, non erit recta anima ejus in semetipso*, guessing at the meaning עפלה from באמונתו in the corresponding member. 𝔖 read (or heard, *Sebök*) עולה for עפלה. Br and Bu. emend הנעלף for הנה עפלה, and suppose 𝔊 to have read הן עלף. We. emends הָעַוָּל for עפלה. The emendation הנעלף is inappropriate, as it introduces a fainting, discouraged Jew, ready to apostatise, neither צדיק nor בוגד, of whom nothing is said before or after. That is rather a NT. thought, and accordingly this passage is quoted in Heb. 10^{38} from 𝔊. The parallel demands a statement encouraging the faithful to expect deliverance. Probably יָשָׁר is concealed in ישרה, corresponding to צדיק in the next member, and the original text had some such meaning as *The upright shall stay his soul* or *shall deliver his soul* (Am. 2^{14}); or, possibly, by transposition, רא יְעַלֵּף ישר נפשו בו. 𝔐 באמונתו. 𝔊 *ἐκ πιστεώς μου ζήσεται*, which gives the probably correct באמונתי. But *μου* omitted in mss. noted above, and in Gal. 3^{11}.—**5.** By common consent of critics the first couplet of this verse is corrupt. 𝔊 translates היין by *κατοιομένος*, probably a mistake for *κατοινούμενος*. We must first correct 𝔐 ינוה to ירוה, so We. 𝔊 *περάνῃ*, Σ *εὐπραγήσει* or *εὐπορήσει*, 𝔄 probably *ὡραιωθήσεται*, as if from נאוה; so 𝔍 *decorabitur*. The corresponding ולא ישבע in next member certifies

ירוית, and in turn requires יין to be retained, as in all Vrss., although rejected by textual critics. Br., Gie. and Bu. conjecture ואכם כאין for ואף כי היין. We. suspects הוי concealed in היין; Houtsma and Oort suggest הַיָּן. Less change is required, and a sense better parallel to the second member is secured if we read כמו יין (old form כמה) *as with wine* (Zech. 9[15] 10[7]) and vocalise גָּבַר. For the impossible יהיר rd. יֹתִיר (יוֹתִיר) or יַתִּיר. The two couplets ending with ירוה and ישבע thus become parallel, one making the בוגר insatiable in drinking and the other in eating.—**5.** 𝔐 ולא ישבע. 𝔊 omits conj., which is better.

THE MALEDICTIONS. 2^{6-20}.

6a. Shall not they all of them take up a parable against him, its meaning a riddle to him, and say:

FIRST MALEDICTION. 2^{6b-8}.

[6b]. Wo to him who taketh usury of what is not his; how long!
And presseth heavily the yoke of his pledge!
[7]. Shall not they arise suddenly that exact usury of thee,
And they awake that shall oppress thee,
And thou shalt be their prey?
[8]. For as thou had spoiled many nations,
All the rest of the peoples shall spoil thee.
[For the blood of men and the violence done to the land,
The city and all that dwell therein.]

6a. RV. may be right in translating *a taunting proverb* instead of *its interpretation a riddle*. The meaning is not clear. As translated above it means that the Chaldeans could not believe such threats to be serious and dangerous.—**6b**. This couplet (but not what follows) is put in the mouth of the oppressed nations. The figure is of one who oppresses with *usury* (literally *increaseth*, as in RV.). The oppression of this usurer is such that he requires usury on what he has not lent. Also in the second member 𝔐 may be right, in which case the meaning will be, *That maketh heavy on himself pledges;* but it seems better to regard the burden of the *yoke* (for *on himself*) to be borne by the oppressed.—**8b**. It is perfectly evident that this couplet is out of place and has in some way been inserted from [17b].

SECOND MALEDICTION. $2^{9\text{-}11}$.

[9]. Wo to him that gaineth an evil gain to his house,
To set his nest in a high place
To escape from the hand of evil.
[10]. Thou hast devised shame to thine own house;
Thou hast cut off many peoples,
And brought guilt on thine own self.
[11]. For the stone shall cry out of the wall,
And the brace out of the timber shall answer it [and say]

9–10. It is noticeable that these have three members, as in v. ^{7}. In each case the third member is essential to develop the thought. One might think from v. ^{9} that the *wo* was directed against Edom whose *nest* was *in a high place*, but v. ^{10} with its repetition of the multiplied conquests applies the malediction still to the Chaldeans.—**11.** The figure of a stone and a timber from the oppressor's house prophesying is a violent one, and it does not come naturally from the preceding verse; and we may suspect that this verse, with the next malediction, is a later addition.

THIRD MALEDICTION. $2^{12\text{-}14}$.

[12]. Wo to him 'that buildeth' a city 'by blood,'
And foundeth a town 'by crime.'
[13]. Are not these the words of the Lord of hosts:
'And the people shall toil but for the fire,
And the nations weary themselves for nothing.'
[14]. 'For the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of Yahweh, as the waters cover the sea.'

Here is a remarkable succession of quotations, definitely designated as such and depending on a previous collection of sacred books. We can hardly doubt that this malediction, with v. ^{11} which introduces it, is the late addition of one who was not himself an original and authoritative prophet, but a scribe.—**12.** This passage from Mi. 3^{10} was addressed to the oppressive Jewish rulers who were building Zion and Jerusalem by forced service, but is here applied to the Chaldean power under the figure of a house.—**13.** The first sentence in this verse is to be regarded as prose, to introduce a poetic quotation from Je. 5^{58}. The quotation is not literal, but *ad sensum*, and arranged for the trimeter measure. In this case the quotation is apposite, as Jeremiah's prediction was against Babylon.—**14.** The quotation from Is. 11^9 is not metrical, nor has it any particular bearing on the subject, but is merely a pious reflection thrown in at hazard.

FOURTH MALEDICTION. 2^{15-17}.

[15]. Wo to him that maketh his neighbour drunk from the cup of thy wrath.
Even making them drunken, so as to look on nakedness.
[16]. [Thou art sated with shame for glory.]
Drink thou too, and show thy uncircumcision.
The cup of Yahweh's right hand shall come round to thee,
And shame upon thy glory.
[17]. For the violence done to Lebanon shall cover thee,
And the destruction of the cattle shall affright thee.
The blood of men and the violence done to the land,
The city and all who dwell therein.

The irregularity of the metre in vv. [15-16] suggests that lines have been inflated, perhaps by the addition of the clauses *from the cup of thy wrath*, *Even making them drunken* and *right hand*.—**15.** The suffix in *thy wrath* disagrees with *his neighbour*, but the transition to 2 pers. sg. agrees with v. [16]. For a similar use of the figure of the shame of uncovered nakedness see Na. 3^5. The story of Noah's drunkenness, and the care to keep his body covered, is one of many cases in OT. in which that sense of modesty is illustrated which Greek writers say characterised the Persians, and which also appears in Assyrian art, but is absent in Greek and Egyptian art.—**16.** The omission of the first clause is required, as it anticipates the cause of the shame in the next two members, and repeats the last member. Literally, *be uncircumcised;* a strong expression for *show thyself uncircumcised*, implying the double shame of personal exposure and also uncircumcision. —**17.** We cannot be certain what particular invasion of an enemy is referred to. From the earliest times the conquerors cut the timber of Lebanon, killed its cattle and hunted its wild beasts, as is narrated by various kings both of Babylonia and Assyria. There is progress in the description of ravage from the ruin of the forests to the slaughter of the cities.

FIFTH MALEDICTION. 2^{18-20}.

[18]. [What is the profit of a graven image, that its maker hath graven it, the molten image and the teacher of lies, that its framer trusted in it to make dumb idols.]

[19]. Wo to him that saith to the wood, 'Awake, arouse thyself!'
To the dumb stone, 'It shall teach!'
Behold it is overlaid with gold and silver,
And there is no breath at all within it.
[20]. But Yahweh is in his holy temple;
Hush before him, all the earth!

The entire malediction probably comes from a later editor who wrote long after the time of the Captivity. It is general against idolatry and has no special pertinency as against the oppressors. Certainly the prosaic v. ^{18} must be expunged. It is crudely composed, and appears to be such an outbreak as a scribe might have hastily jotted in the margin.—**18.** The expression, *teacher of lies*, applied to a *molten image*, seems to imply a certain residual belief in a real power of heathen gods. Literally, *the framer of his frame trusteth in it*, an inelegant redundancy.—**19.** Here 𝔊 gives us the true division. Both wood and stone are given as materials for idols, but it is the wood that is overlaid with gold or silver. Very small idols of gold have been found. The expressions are taken from Is. 44^9 *sq.*—**20.** The *temple* is represented as in full service. It is likely that from the last clause is drawn Ẓp. 1^7.

6. 𝔐 ויאמר. 𝔊 𝔖 have pl. So We., who omits עד מתי, but the vocal balance of the two members requires it, as מרבה corresponds to מכביר, also לא לו to עלו, and עד מתי to עבטיט. 𝔐 עליו. 𝔊 *τὸν κλοιὸν αὐτοῦ*. Oort emends עֻלּוֹ.—3. The last couplet in this verse is rejected by De Goeje, We., *et al.* It has been intruded from v. ^{17}, but is inappropriate here as confusing the thought of an usurer with that of slaughter.

10. We. remarks that קצות and חוטא must be made to correspond in form, for 𝔐 קצות 𝔊 has *συνεπέρανας*, reading קִצּוֹתָ. So 𝔍 𝔖 𝔗. Accordingly חוטא must be corrected to חטאת.—**13.** 𝔐 הִנֵּה. By consent of critics it should be pointed הֵנָּה, to introduce the following quotations. —**15.** 𝔐 מספח. We. emends מִסַּף after Zc. 12^2. This makes better sense and a good parallelism. The ח was intruded by dittog. Some Vrss. make מ a prep., but fail to understand חמ.. 𝔄 ἐξ *ἐκπεμψέως* (or *ἐπιρ-*

ῥιψέως) *χόλου, ἀπὸ χυσέως θυμοῦ σου.* Origen's E read *ἐξ ἀπροσδοκήτου ἀνατροπῆς τῆς ὀργῆς σου.* The suffix of חמתך offers some difficulty, and is omitted by 𝕲 𝕾 𝕬 and 𝕿. Σ reads *ἑαυτοῦ.* But sf. is original and represents rapid transition. 𝕸 מעוריהם We. emends מְעָרֵיהֶם after Na. 3^{5}. This is suggested by 𝕲's error *σπήλαια αὐτῶν.*—**16.** Either the first or last clause of this verse should be expunged, perhaps both. We. removes the first clause, and puts it in place of the last, changing שבעת to תשבע. It is better to retain the last clause (changing קיקלון to קלון, as שבע is hardly the word to follow כוס in v. ^{16} and the words for drinking in v. ^{15}. For 𝕸 הערל 𝕲 has *καὶ διασαλεύθητι,* 𝕬 *καώθητι.* 𝕾 and 𝕴 also probably read והערל, as do many commentators; but the text of 𝕸 makes better sense.—**17.** 𝕸 יחיתן makes no sense. 𝕲 *πτοήσει σε.* So 𝕾 and 𝕿. Ew., Ols., We., Oort emend יחיתך. 𝕸 מדמי. The last couplet, to be dropped from v. ^{8}, seems required here, with omission of the prep. which the connection required in v. ^{8} and was then intruded here.—**18.** This verse is not rhythmical and is an intruded gloss. St., We., *et al.*, transpose vv. $^{18.\ 19}$.—**19.** 𝕸 עורי. 𝕲 *οὐαὶ ὁ λέγων τῷ ξύλῳ ἔκνηψον, ἐξεγέρθητι, καὶ τῷ λίθῳ ὑψώθητι, καὶ αὐτό ἐστιν φαντασία.* This gives a division of the members preferable to that in 𝕸, although 𝕲 erroneously read רומי for דומם and מראה (as it did in v. ^{18}) for יורה (מורה in v. ^{18}). (Read עורה for עורי to correspond with הקיצה.) By putting דומם and יורה in the same line we get a fine antithesis, and יורה makes a paronomasia with עורה in the previous line.

THE PSALM—CHAPTER 3.

For emendations of the text of chs. 1 and 2 we have had to depend mainly on 𝕲, but we have occasionally noted another small class of mss. For ch. 3 we fortunately have more help from this class of mss., chiefly 23, 62, 86 and 147 of HP. Two of these are among the more ancient mss., and one is an uncial. They agree in being based on a text quite variant from 𝕸 and so of special value. Cornill says in his *Ezekiel* that 62, 147 are not Lucianic. So Vollers, *ZATW.*, 1883, 4, p. 239, says that this group goes back to "*sehr alte und wertvolle Vorlagen.*"

Ch. 3 is not a recounting of past triumphs, and contains only covert allusions to early Hebrew history. It simply considers the present distress, and seeks and receives a theophany of deliverance. Yahweh comes in the guise of an armed warrior, with horses and chariot, bow and quiver, in storm and lightning, to overthrow the enemy. He starts from his Olympus in Mount Paran, moves northward to Palestine, and affrights land and sea with his thunder and tempest. It is to Palestine that Yahweh comes with help, but there is nothing by which we can decide what particular exigency required his aid. We are told of the possible or actual failure of the fruits of the earth, but whether by drought or by the ravages of war we are not told, but the aid of Yahweh implies the latter. Very likely this psalm belongs to the Maccabean period.

1. *The Prayer of Habakkuk the Prophet. On the Stringed Instruments.* This is the title. Inasmuch as 𝔊 translates *Shigionoth* with the same word ᾠδῆς as it does *Neginoth* in v. [19], we may make the correction.

Introductory Prayer for a Theophany, V. [2].

[2]. Yahweh, I hear the sound of thee;
I see, Yahweh, thy work.
In the midst of the years display it;
In the midst of the years make it known;
In wrath remember mercy.

In the first part of this verse the psalmist anticipates the desired theophany, and in the last part prays that it may speedily develop. The change of *I fear* of 𝔐 to *I see*, gives a much more appropriate sense as well as a perfect parallelism. He desires that the theophany be not long delayed, but that deliverance might come during the present years.

Theophany in the Storm. Vv. [3-13].

[3]. God cometh from Teman
And the Holy One from Mount Paran.
His glory covereth the heavens,
And the earth is full of his praise.
[4]. Before him it is like the light;
Rays he hath at his side,
And he rejoiceth in the glory of his strength.
[5]. Before him goeth Pestilence,
And Plague followeth behind him.

[6]. He standeth, and the earth trembleth;
He looketh, and the nations melt away;
And the mountains of old are scattered,
The ancient hills bow down.
[7]. [*Untranslatable, probably two lines.*]
The tents of Cushan tremble,
The curtains of the land of Midian.
[8]. With the rivers art thou wroth, O Yahweh?
[Is thy indignation against the rivers?]
Is thine anger against the sea,
That thou ridest upon thy horses,
Thy chariot of salvation?
[9]. Thou dost quite uncover thy bow,
Thy quiver is filled with shafts. Selah.
[With rivers thou cleavest the earth.]
[10]. The waters see thee and they writhe;
The clouds pour down their waters.
The depth giveth forth his voice.
The height lifteth his hands.
[11]. The sun [is hidden in his chamber].
The moon standeth still in his dwelling.
For light thine arrows go forth,
For brightness the glittering of thy spear.
[15]. Thou treadest the sea with thy horses,
The mighty waters foam up.
[12]. In rage thou marchest over the earth,
In wrath thou tramplest the nations.
Thou goest forth for the salvation of thy people,
To save thine anointed ones.

[13]. Thou crushest the head of the wicked. [Thou piercest with thy shafts the head of the oppressors; they stormed out to scatter me; their rejoicing was as to devour the poor secretly.]

It is better to put this whole theophany in the present tense. That which the prophet has prayed for he sees now in vision as on the way. First Yahweh is described, then his companions are designated, and then follows the description of his march in lightning and storm. His home is in the Arabian mountains; his movement is recognised in thunder and rain; the lightnings are his arrows and spear, the thunder the rattling of his chariot and horses. There follows a deluge of rain, and the rivers overflow, and the sea dashes with foam. The storm-cloud hides the sun and moon, as he marches forth trampling Israel's foes. With his home on the mountains, his weapons of thunder, lightning, storm and war, he is such a god as the Syrian and Babylonian

Adad. We now have, not a recounting of past triumphs, but only covert allusions to the events of Sinai and Canaan. The prophet simply considers the present distress, and seeks and receives a theophany of deliverance.

3. The mountain home of Yahweh is based on the memory of Sinai. The first couplet is imitated from Dt. 33^2.—**4.** The *rays* proceed from *his side,* not *hand,* as in RV. The older Babylonian art often represented solar deities with rays proceeding from the body. *And there is the hiding of his power,* 𝔐, is jejune and has to be conjecturally emended. While that here proposed is not assured, some such change is necessary.—**5.** *Pestilence and plague* are here personified as Yahweh's attendants, just as Homer gives to *Ares* the companions Fear and Terror (Φόβος and Δειμός) when he goes forth to fight the Greeks. It is also in accordance with oriental ideas to represent pestilence or a destructive wind as a demon, or chimera, accompanying a god. *Marduk* was thus accompanied when he fought *Tiamat.* So an angel of pestilence appeared after David had numbered the people. 2 S. $22^{16.\ 17}$.

6–7. There is no intelligible meaning in 𝔐, *He stood and measured the earth.* 𝔊 indicates how the text must be corrected. The last clause of this verse with the beginning of v. ^{7}, is untranslatable, and we have not the material for reconstruction. The mss. already quoted had a Hebrew text which gave a full couplet, *The roadways of old shall be changed; on his account the world shall be shaken.* RV. has *His goings were as of old,* as if referring to Sinai. The margin has *His ways are everlasting.* Both are unsatisfactory, and 𝔊 gives a more satisfactory translation, *his eternal roadways, i. e., the mountains and hills.* The last six words of v. ^{7} make a good couplet, leaving the first three words *I saw in affliction* (RV.) as material for the couplet which begins with the last three words of v. ^{6}. The lands of *Cushan* and *Midian* first feel the terror of the theophany, as nearest to Mount Paran.

8. Here the prophet turns from the thunder and wind which shook the hills to note the effect of the rain and storm on the *rivers* and *sea.* But he very naturally turns to view the *God* who creates the commotion as he comes with horses and chariot. An apparent infelicity in representing him as *upon* horses, and yet with a chariot, has led 𝔊 to translate *chariot* by ἱππασία, while our special class of mss. put the chariots, ἅρματα, in the first clause, and ἱππασία in the second, which avoids the confusion of thought. —**9.** It is only by a bold conjecture, following our special class of mss., that any intelligible meaning can be made out of this verse. The correction thus suggested makes a good parallelism, and the only difficulty is with the translation of מטות as *shafts, i.e.*, arrows or javelins. Our mss., however, translate it by βολίδας, unless they possibly read חצות for מטות. The order of thought is then clear. The rivers and sea were affrighted as Yahweh approached with the thunder of his chariot and horses. They saw him with his bow uncovered, taken from the armoury where it was protected by a covering, and now ready to be drawn. From his quiver he takes his weapons and hurls his spear and arrows of lightning. They see, and the next verse tells us that they writhe in terror. Syrian and Hittite art frequently represents *Adad-Ramman*, god of storm, as armed with the same weapons, while the Babylonian art gave this western god the forked thunderbolt. The last, unbalanced clause of this verse may be regarded as intruded.

10. Fortunately we have in Ps. 77^{17-20} the means for some emendations of vv. $^{10-12.\ 15}$. The Psalm is later, and adds a third member after the couplets. It also has a different purpose, that of recalling the escape of Israel from Egypt, while Habakkuk makes no reference to Israelite history, but simply presents a theophany of judgment under the figure of a storm. The correction of *mountains* to *waters*, follows the Ps. and makes a much better connection of thought with v. ^{8}. Equally the emendation in the second member of this couplet greatly strengthens the thought, for the *passing* of the tempest is no occasion for fear.—**11.** A couplet originally took the place of the single line of four beats which tells how the dark clouds hid the sun and moon. We must here follow our class of mss. The *dwelling*, זבול, has no relation to the rabbinic use of the word as one of the seven firmaments, but is used indefinitely as is *tabernacle* in Ps. 19^{4}. The translation of the last couplet in RV. is jejune, *at the light of thine arrows as they* *went.* The meaning is that of Ps. 77[18], *The lightnings enlightened the world.* For the use of the preposition *cf.* Is. 60[19]. There is no reference here to Joshua's miracle, but only the statement that the sun and moon retire behind the black clouds, and that their place is taken by flashes of lightning, represented as Yahweh's arrows.

12–15. It is evident that v. [15] is out of place after vv. [12–14]. It belongs with vv. [10. 11], as it continues in order the series of expressions found in Ps. 77[17-20]. It must therefore follow v. [11].—**15.** This corresponds to Ps. 77[20], the resemblance being much closer in the Hebrew than in an English translation. If placed before v. [8] the connection might seem better, but the parallelism with Ps. 77 fixes it after v. [11]. The *trampling of the nations* of v. [12] also fitly follows the treading of *the sea* of v. [15].—**13.** In *a* we have the purpose of all this theophany. Kuenen shows that the title of *thine anointed* applied to Israel is proof of a postexilic period, as Ps. 84[10]. But as it antedates Ps. 77[17-20] it does not belong to the later postexilic period, but might well belong to the 5th or 4th century B.C. The sg. is probably correct, although the Jewish recensions of 𝕲 make *anointed* pl., as do the special mss. quoted. The latter part of the verse would require much change to make it intelligible, and the Vrss. give no real help. The *house* and the *foundation* have no pertinence, and they have no relation to the *rock*.—**14.** This verse is equally unintelligible, except as to the last clause, which is quite out of place, as it represents a personal and not a national calamity, in which the pious poor were the sufferers. As the text stands it cannot be made metrical, and we have not the data for restoring it. Probably the whole is an intrusion.

THE PROPHET'S MEDITATION ON THE THEOPHANY. Vv. [16-19].

[16]. I have heard, and my belly trembleth;
My lips quiver at the sound.
Rottenness entereth into my bones,
And my steps tremble under me.
I moan in view of the day of trouble,
Of the coming up of the people that will assail me.

[17]. For though the fig-tree bear no fruit,
And there be no vintage on the vines;
Though the yield of the olive fail,
And the fields produce no food;
Though the flock be cut off from the fold,
And there be no herd in the stall,
[18]. Yet I will exult "in Yahweh."
I will rejoice "in the God of my salvation."
[19]. Yahweh, the Lord, is my strength,
And he setteth "my feet like those of hinds
And he maketh me" tread "on my high places."
To the chorister on the stringed instruments.

16. This verse requires correction to make the latter half intelligible. The correction of *which* to *my steps* is assured, but that of *I moan* in place of *I rest* is only suggested. The immediate effect of the theophany is not the faith and courage that might have been expected, but affright; and yet not fear of the terrible theophany, but of the approaching foe. It may be that the original text avoided this revulsion of fear, and anticipated *rest* after the invasion, just as the succeeding verses begin with the anticipation of evil, but end with trust and exultation. *Cf.* Dn. 12^{13}.—**17.** The couplets in this verse may properly be translated as conditional, although the text would allow them to describe the state of desolation and famine following the invasion of an enemy.—**18.** This verse is based on Mi. 7^{7}, but is not a close quotation.—**19.** This is taken almost directly from 2 S. 22^{34} which is identical with Ps. 18^{34}, and indirectly from Dt. 32^{13} 33^{29}. It denotes possession and rule of the land. The quotations in the two last verses, with those in 2^{12-14}, indicate an authorship at a period later than the first standard collection of the Sacred Books. The writer was familiar with Deuteronomy, 2 Samuel, Isaiah, Jeremiah and Micah, who is quoted twice. We have also the parallelism of $2^{10.\ 11.\ 15}$ with Ps. 77^{17-20}, in which we have preferred, but with reserve, to regard Habakkuk as the original source. The facility of quotation, especially from Micah, is an argument in favor of a common authorship of chs. 2 and 3.

1. 𝔐 שגיונות, 𝔊 *μετὰ ᾠδῆς*, reading נגינות as in v. ^{19}.—**2.** 𝔐 יראתי, which destroys both parallel and measure. Rd. ראיתי. The fear is not appropriate till after the theophany, and not to be expected before

v. [16]. 𝔐 חייהו. 𝔊 *ζῴων*, as reading חיות. 𝔖 read חיים. The parallel requires חויהו, *cf.* Ps. 19[3], corresponding to תודע.—**3.** In 𝔐 הארץ omit art. inserted by dittog.—**4.** ונגה as if נגה were fem. Rd. נגהֹה, the final ה being 3 masc. sf., as in עזה, v. [4]. נגהה corresponds with מידו, at his side, in the next member. The f. תהיה is impersonal, *Before him it is like light.* 𝔐 ושם חביון. The text is corrupt, and was not understood by the Vrss. 𝔊 *καὶ ἔθετο ἀγάπησιν*, reading שָׂם, as do also 𝔄 Σ. An important class of mss. given by HP. related to one of Origen's unnamed mss., and representing an independent version of part, at least, of this chapter, read *ἐκεῖ ἐπιστήρικται ἡ δύναμις τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ.* The most probable emendation is ושמח בגאון עזה. For the use of גאון see Ez. 24[21] 30[18] 33[28] Mi. 5[3] Is. 2[10. 19. 21]. Make קרנים pl. for 𝔐 dual. —**6.** 𝔐 וימדד 𝔊 *καὶ ἐσαλεύθη ἡ γῆ.* We. suggests וימגג, but that destroys the paronomasia. 𝔊 may have read והמעד, but in bibl. use מעד is confined to *steps*, *feet* or *knees*. Of the earth we would expect וַתָּמֹג. 𝔐 ויתר. 𝔊 *καὶ διετάκη ἔθνη*, as reading וַיִּתְּכוּ. So also 𝔖.—**7.** 𝔐 הליכות עולם לו: תחת און ראיתי. We. says: *Der Vers wird überfült durch* הליכות עולם. The change of metre indicates either an insertion or corruption for v. [7], probably the latter, as the sense is appropriate. According to 𝔐 הליכות means the mountain ranges which are Yahweh's roadway, but the word means *caravans* or *processions*, and should apply to the terrified caravans of the desert. The valuable class of mss. referred to in v. [4] followed a very different text and verse division, reading, *αἱ ὁδοὶ αἱ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀλλοιωθήσονται· αὐτοῦ ἕνεκα σεισθήσεται ἡ οἰκουμένη. Κατανενόηκα τὰς σκηνὰς Αἰθιόπων κ. τ. λ.*, omitting לו and connecting הליכות with a succeeding verb, and then adding a new parallel member. Possibly for תחת און we should read הִתְחַתּוּ (*the caravans were affrighted*), but there is not material to make a probable reconstruction, and indeed it is not certain whether הליכות—ראיתי represents one member or two. The second appearance of עולם is suspicious, עליו?—**8.** 𝔐 אם בנהרים אפך, which is redundant, following Bi., *et al.* 𝔐 חרה. 𝔊 *ὠργίσθης κύριε.* Perhaps we should read חרית.—**9.** 𝔐 תעור pass. is weak. We expect 2 sg. m. as 𝔊 *ἐντείνων ἐνέτεινας.* Rd. הֵעָרָה, which is better. 𝔐 שבעות מטות אמר is untranslatable and corrupt. None of the versions give aid, except those mss. which read *ἐχόρτασας βολίδας τῆς φαρέτρας αὐτῆς.* This makes an admirable parallel. For שבעות they read a form of v. [6] שבע, and for אמר they read אשפה. *βολὶς* also translates חציך in v. [11]. 𝔖 also takes מטות as *arrows*. Probably the original read שִׂבַּעְתָּ (or שִׂבַּעְתָּ) מטות אשפה or אשפתך. In the older writing the resemblance of אמר and אשפה is much closer than in the square letters. The last three words of this verse have either lost their parallel member, or are intruded.—**10.** Vv. [10. 12. 15] must be emended by Ps. 77[17-20], which is based on Habakkuk, but with a third member added to the couplet. 𝔐 הרים. 𝔊 *λαοί*, reading עמים. Both come from המים, which we accept, following Ps. 77[17] ראוך מים יחילו. 𝔐 זרם מים עבר must be corrected after Ps. 77[18]. זרמו מים עבות . . . 𝔐 רום. 𝔊 *ὕψος* as reading מרום, which gives a better parallel.—**11.** 𝔐 inserts ירח to the injury of metre and grammar. The MSS. quoted above give a full couplet. *φῶς τὸ λαμπρὸν τοὺ ἡλίου ἔπεσχεν· τὸ δέ φέγγος τῆς σελήνης ἐστάθη.* The second member must be filled up, to say that the moon was withdrawn into its dark chamber behind the clouds. Bi. ventures to complete the couplet by inserting אורה החזיקה before שמש. 𝔐 יהלכו, should be emended יתהלכו, after Ps. 77[18]. The subject is חציך, as in 𝔊 *εἰς φῶς βολίδες σου πορεύσονται.* For use of prep. in לאור and לנגה see Is. 60[19].

12–15. Vv. [12-14] interrupt the series of quotations from Ps. 77[17-20], and interrupt the sense by the insertion of a difficult and irrelevant explanatory passage. Gumpach, De Goeje and Kue. put v. [15] after v. [7], but it is better to throw vv. [12-14] after v. [15]. We then have vv. [10. 11. 15] parallel to Ps. 77[16-19], and the corresponding passages in the same order, Hb. 3[18a] corresponding to Ps. 77[17a]; v. [10b] to [18a]; [11b] to [18b]; [11b] to [19b]; and [15a] and [b] to [20a] and [b]. To put v. [15] after v. [7] would dislocate the parallel.—**13.** 𝔐 חמר. We. suggests doubtfully חמרו; Bi. emends to בחמר. The mss. already quoted read: *ἐταράχθη* (חמרו) *τὰ ἐξαίσια ὕδατα*; 𝔊 *ταράσσοντας* (חָמַר) *ὕδωρ πολύ.* 𝔐 gives no connected sense. Perhaps חמר should be corrected to המו, following Je. 51[55] והמו גליהם כמים רבים, *cf.* Ps. 46[4] or המירו, *cf.* Ps. 46[3]. The corresponding passage in Ps. 77[20] has דרכך for דרכת סוסיך, and שביליך for חמר.—**12.** לישע את משיחך. 𝔊 *τοῦ σῶσαι τὸν χριστόν σου.* The mss. quoted above read *ῥύσασθαι τοὺς χριστούς σου.* Both make לישע a vb. as required by את. We. emends to יְשַׁע for יהושיע. The second couplet is corrupt past recovery. The Vrss. have made no sense of it. 𝔊 seems to have read מות (*θάνατον*) for מבית. Our special mss. make sense, but vary much from 𝔐. They read *κατετόξευσας κεφαλάς ἀνθρώπων ὑπερηφάνων· ἕως ἀβύσσου τοῦ τῆς θαλάσσης καταδύσονται*, as if מחצת were related to חצים. It appears to have begun with עד תהום. One of Jerome's mss. gave *ornasti*, as if reading עדית in place of ערות. The last clause seems to have been greatly corrupted after the intrusion of בית in the previous clause, making it fit a house instead of a wicked people, *cf.* Ps. 68[22] 110[5.6].—**14.** This verse appears to be prose. The first four words correspond to the first four of v. [13], and the intrusion seems to be quite late, as the *devouring of the poor secretly* has no relation to the foreign oppressor. 𝔐 במטיו. Bi. and We. emend to במטיך. The mss. cited read, *ἐξεδίκησας* (נקמת) *μετὰ δυνάμεως σου τούς ἀρχηγοὺς τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν* (פריציכ) *τοὺς πεποιθότας* (יסערו) *ἐπὶ τῇ αὐθαδείᾳ* (?rabbinic חוצפא) *αὐτων ἕνεκεν τοῦ καταφαγεῖν τοὺς πτωχοὺς λάθρα.* 𝔊 gives *διέκοψας ἐν ἐκστάσει* (for *εκτάσει*) *κεφαλὰς δυνάστων, σεισθήσονται ἐν αὐτῇ* (יסערו לה, for יס).

διανοίξουσι (from יצה) *χαλινοὺς αὐτῶν* (מצלות, Zc. 14^{20}) *ὡς ἔσθων πτωχοὺς λάθρα.* The corruption לאכל עני במסתר may have come from an original לאכלני.

16. 𝔐 ארגז אשר emended by Bi. and We. to read אֲשֻׁרַי with corresponding vb. אשרי takes a f. sg. vb., see Ps. 37^{31} 44^{19} 75^{2}. 𝔊 *ἐτάραχθη ἡ ἕξις μου.* From 𝔐 אנוח ליום צרה לעלות לעם יגורנו it is impossible to get any consistent meaning. 𝔊 follows 𝔐 except that for לעם יגורנו it has *εἰς λαὸν παροικίας* reaching a form of גור with 1 p. sg. affix. The mss. quoted read *ταῦτα φυλάξῃς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ θλίψεως, ἐπαγαγεῖν ἐπὶ ἔθνος* (or *ἔφενος*) *πολεμοῦν* (or *πολέμου*) *τὸν λαόν σου.* 𝔖 is quite variant for this couplet, and its text it is not easy to recover. For 𝔐 יגורנו it appears to have read יגירנו. 𝔙 has *ad populum accinctum nostrum* for 𝔐 לעם יגורנו, reading a form of חגר. Both 𝔊 and 𝔙 agree in reading ר for ד. Perhaps 𝔊's גור is correct, but with the meaning, to fear, instead of, to sojourn. We should probably read יגודנו, *who will attack me*, or something like אגורנו, or מגורי, *whom I fear.* For the inappropriate 𝔐 אנוח it might be hazardous to conjecture אֵאָנַח, meaning *I moan in view of the day of trouble*, but nothing better occurs. For use of prep. ל in place of עַל or מִן after אאנח, *cf.* use of ל after בכה and גור, Je. 22^{10} Jb. 30^{25}.—**17.** 𝔐 הפרח 𝔊 *καρποφορήσει.* We. emends to הפרה. עשה f. pl. (J. P. Peters, *Hebraica*, 1888, p. 111). גזר. We. נגזר. 𝔐 ממכלה for ממכלאו.—**18.** 𝔐 בנגינותי Ew., *et al.*, emend by omitting **sf.** Kue. either thus or בנגינותיו following 𝔊 *ἐν τῇ ᾠδῇ αὐτοῦ.*

A
CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL
COMMENTARY

ON

OBADIAH AND JOEL

BY

JULIUS A. BEWER, Ph.D.
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL PHILOLOGY UNION THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY, NEW YORK.

INTRODUCTION TO OBADIAH.

§ 1. THE COMPOSITION OF THE BOOK.

The first literary problem in Ob. is the relation of vv. $^{1-9}$ to Je. $49^{7\,\mathrm{ff.}}$. These passages are so much alike that they cannot be independent of one another. Either Ob. quoted from Je., or Je. quoted from Ob., or both quoted from an older oracle. Every one of these positions has been taken by scholars. At present, as a result of Caspari's investigation, almost all writers believe that Je. 49 quoted from Ob. But a renewed comparison of both texts shows that the more original text is contained in Je. 49; that Ob. quoted vv. $^{1-4}$ almost, though not quite, literally; that he commented on this older oracle in vv. $^{5-7}$ partly in the words of the older prophet, partly in his own words, in order to show that it had been fulfilled in his own day; and that in vv. $^{8.\,9}$ he quoted once more from the older oracle without any show of literalness. These conclusions involve the originality of vv. $^{6.\,8.\,9}$. See the detailed discussion on pp. 33 *ff.*

In vv. $^{10.\,11}$ Ob. proceeds to state the reasons for Edom's calamity, continues with a vivid description of her cruel behaviour toward Judah at the fall of Jerusalem, thrown into the form of impassioned warnings (vv. $^{12-14}$) and ends by declaring that her present punishment is in just requital for her own deeds (v. ^{15b}).—On an attempt to athetize vv. $^{12-14}$ as secondary, *cf.* text. n. *ad loc.*

With v. ^{15a} we enter upon a different range of thought. The writer does not describe a present calamity but hopes for the punishment of Edom on the day when Yahweh will judge all nations. These verses have therefore grown out of a different situation. Ob. interpreted events that had just transpired, when Edom had been dispossessed by her former allies. This writer expects the day of Yahweh in the near future and confidently believes that Edom will be utterly destroyed by *Israel*. Evidently some time had passed since Ob. had written, Edom had, after all, not been completely destroyed but was living on, a menace and vexation to Judah. No redress seemed possible at present, and so the writer looks forward to the future, to the day when Yahweh will hold his judgment on all the nations. Then Edom's turn will also come and its terrible punishment will be administered by Israel. It is not likely that Ob. was the writer of these verses, and Wellhausen was right in regarding vv.[15a. 16-21] as an appendix. There is also, if the text is correct, such a sudden change of address in v.[16] from the Edomites to the Jews that the same author can hardly be credited with it.

There are two sections in this appendix, vv.[15a. 16-18] and vv.[19-21], and we may question whether they are by the same author. Vv.[19-21] are in the nature of a commentary on vv.[17b. 18], and it seems that v.[19] with its list of territories understood v.[17b] as saying that the house of Jacob would regain its *possessions*. Originally v.[17b] spoke of Judah's conquest over her *dispossessors* (see text. n). That there existed this difference of interpretation of v.[17b] is clear from 𝔐 and 𝔊 respectively. If this point is pressed we must probably conclude that vv.[19-21] are by a different author who understood v.[17b] not as its writer had meant it but of the reconquest of Israel's territories, and who connected his list of such territories very ingeniously with his comment on v.[18], by explaining that this prophecy will be fulfilled by what is still left of the house of Jacob and of the house of Joseph, *i. e.*, the Israelitish and the Judean exiles. They will regain the land, the Israelites as far north as Sarephath, the Judeans including all the cities of the Southland. But the thoughts of the driving out of the dispossessors and of the regaining of the territories are closely enough related that the same writer may naturally pass from the one to the other, esp. when it is possible to express both by the same Heb. word. And we need not wonder that v.[19] thinks not only of the Edomites as to be driven out as in v.[17] but of others also, when the setting which the writer gives to the punishment of Edom is the day of Yahweh's judgment on *all* the nations.

That v.[18] looks like a conclusion is due to the final formula *for Yahweh hath spoken.* But this is really a quotation-formula. For contents and metre alike show that v. ^{18} is an older prophecy which our author incorporated in order to establish the hope which he entertained concerning the future victory of Israel over Edom.

History of the literary criticism of Obadiah. Eichhorn (*Einl.*^{4}, 1824, iv, 320 *ff.*, not yet in ^{3}, 1803) appears to have been the first to doubt the unity of Ob. He dated Ob. after 586 B.C. and regarded vv. $^{17-21}$ as an appendix from the time of Alexander Jannæus. He entitled the whole book, *Obadjas. Auf die Unterjochung der Edomiter durch Nebukadnezar zwischen* 582–572 *vor Chr. nach einer neuen Ausgabe des Gesanges unter Alexander Jannaeus zwischen* 106–80 *vor Chr.* (*cf.* also *Hebr. Proph.*, iii, 524). Eich.'s view was not adopted.—Ewald took up the problem afresh and presented an entirely different solution. Acc. to him the book was the work of an exilic prophet who had used in vv. $^{1-10}$ an older prophecy by Ob., a contemporary of Isaiah, and in vv. $^{15-18}$ also older material which came from a prophet like Zc. 9–11, who, acc. to Ew., was an older contemporary of Isaiah. V. ^{16}, though also older material, was not of the same piece as vv. $^{15.\ 17.\ 18}$. To the exilic prophet belong vv. $^{11-14.\ 19-21}$. This position, though with some modifications in details, won the assent of many. Kautzsch and Driver limited the older oracle to vv. $^{1-9}$ (not ^{10}), G. A. Smith to vv. $^{1-6}$. Kautzsch was not quite sure "*whether remnants of the ancient oracle* may not also have been preserved in vv. $^{15-21}$." But König, who analysed the second part of the oracle, concluded that the older oracle consisted of vv. $^{1-10.\ 16a.\ 18.\ 19a\alpha.\ 20b}$.—A new phase in the literary criticism of Ob. began with Wellhausen, who regards vv. $^{1-14.\ 15b}$ (exc. $^{6.\ 8.\ 9.\ 12}$) as the work of Ob., the remaining verses as a later appendix. This solution was adopted in substance by Now., Marti, Cor.^{5}, Du.—The weak point in it is that it does not correctly explain the relation between Ob. and Je. Barton perceived this and presented a combination of Ew.'s and We.'s theories: vv. $^{1-6}$ are a pre-exilic oracle of Ob., which was quoted by Je. and re-adapted with additions (vv. $^{7-15}$) by another Ob. in the early postexilic days; vv. $^{16-21}$ form an appendix probably from Maccabean times.—A small minority of scholars, among them Peters, Van H., Hal., still maintain the unity of the book. But even so conservative and careful a scholar as Orelli regards vv. $^{19-21}$ as a later appendix.

§ 2. THE DATE OF THE BOOK.

The result of the literary criticism of Ob. necessitates the determination of the time of the various component parts of the book. In the absence of all external data, we must rely on internal evidence.

The two points that have always been used for the fixing of the date are also important for us: the description of the fall of Jerusalem in vv. $^{10-14}$, and Ob.'s relation to Je. 49.

Since the date of Je. $49^{7 \text{ ff.}}$ was regarded as definitely fixed in the 4th year of Jehoiakim (*cf.* $25^{1 \text{ ff.}}$) those who believed in the priority of Ob. connected the capture of Jerusalem, in spite of all difficulties, either with the raid of the Philistines and Arabians under Jehoram (2 Ch. $21^{16 \text{ f.}}$), or with the campaign of Joash of Israel against Amaziah (2 K. $14^{13 \text{ f.}}$ 2 Ch. $25^{23 \text{ f.}}$). They could not identify it with the capture by the Chaldeans in 586 B.C., though this was, as some acknowledged, the most natural reference. Those who believed in the priority of Je. referred it, of course, to 586 B.C. For them it was merely a question whether Ob. was exilic or postexilic. Also those who believed that both Je. and Ob. had quoted from an older oracle could put Ob. in the exilic or postexilic period. And when the prophecies against the nations (chs. 46 *ff.*) came to be quite generally regarded as non-Jeremian, it was possible also for those who believed in the priority of Ob. to identify the fall of Jerusalem with that of 586 B.C. and to place Ob. in or after the exile.

The most natural identification of this capture of Jerusalem is the one in 586 B.C. by the Chaldeans, when acc. to La. $4^{21 \text{ f.}}$ Ez. 25^{12-14} 30^{5} $35^{1 \text{ ff.}}$ 137^{7} 3 Esd. 4^{45} Edom acted very cruelly toward the Judeans. It is true that neither the Chaldeans nor the destruction of the temple nor the deportation of the whole people are explicitly mentioned. But the situation is well defined, and critical opinion is more and more agreed on the reference to 586 B.C. Moreover, the fact that a quotation from a Jeremian dirge (Je. 38^{22}), which dated from the last days of Jerusalem, is incorporated in v. ^{7} shows that 586 B.C. had passed and that the fall of Jerusalem described here cannot refer to a pre-exilic situation. Nor can a reference to a later conquest be maintained. Winckler connected the verses with a postexilic destruction of Jerusalem about 500 B.C., but such a destruction cannot be proved. And the conquest of Antiochus IV is excluded, because the book of Joel, which was not as late as the 2d cent. B.C., presupposes Ob. (*v. i.*) Our *terminus a quo* is thus 586 B.C.

The description of the calamity which had befallen Edom is suggestive. The enemies who had driven them to the border of their land and who had plundered them, had formerly been good friends and allies, and it was only by treachery that they had succeeded. We know from Diodorus Siculus (19, 94) that in 312 B.C. the Nabateans were in possession of Edom's ancient seats, for it was *vs.* the Nabateans in Petra that Antigonus fought at that time. These Nabateans had therefore taken Mt. Seir before the end of the 4th cent. and had driven Edom northward out of her old territories into the Negeb. How long before 312 B.C. they had succeeded in conquering it, we do not know. But there is every reason to believe that the catastrophe which had befallen Edom in the first half of the 5th cent. and which is described in Mal. 1[1 f.] was due to a defeat by the Nabateans. However, Mal. 1[1 f.] does not imply that Edom had been driven out of its ancient territory. They were still undaunted in Mal.'s time and confidently expected to retrieve their losses. We., following Vatke, suggests that Ob.'s prophetic interpretation of Edom's fall was connected with Mal. 1[1 f.] and that it dealt with one of the stages of the Arabian invasion, though not necessarily with the same as Mal. 1. We have reason to believe that these invasions began as early as the first half of the 6th cent. and that the occupation of the Negeb by Edom shortly after 586 B.C. (*cf.* Ez. 35[10, 12] 36[5]) was due in some degree to the pressure exerted upon Edom by the influx of the Arabians from the desert. Of course, if the description of Ob. is regarded as fairly accurate and if the driving *unto the border* is taken seriously, it would seem that Ob. wrote after Malachi rather than before. And so We. and Now. date him. Marti, Cor., Du. put him before Mal.

But does not the detailed character of the description of the events connected with the fall of Jerusalem make the impression of having been written by one who had first-hand knowledge, and does not the impassioned manner in which it is given betray an actual participant? If this objection is sustained we cannot go beyond the last quarter of the 6th cent. And we should have to refer the invasion of the enemies in Mt. Seir to one of the earlier phases, perhaps during the exile, and we should also have to assume that the Edomites were able to regain their territory from which they had been driven acc. to Ob. ^{7}, for in Mal. $1^{1\,f.}$ they are in Mt. Seir. This is not an easy assumption in view of the character of Mt. Seir, but it is not impossible. The detailed and impassioned character of the description may, however, be accounted for in another way. The story of those unforgettable days, when the holy city fell, must have been told in Jerusalem again and again in all its details. Who knows whether in Ob.'s own, or in a related or befriended family, there was not a tradition of ancestors who had either been robbed or betrayed or killed by the Edomites at that time? As the story was told the vivid oriental imagination of Ob. was filled with all those awful scenes, and made them so real that his heart burned with anger and sorrow. And so when he thought of that day, he seemed to go through those varied scenes himself and to witness Edom's barbarities. It is quite reasonable to account thus for vv. $^{12\text{-}14}$, and to assign Ob.'s date after Mal. in the 5th cent., to which the description in vv. $^{5\text{-}7}$ points so strongly.

This implies that the older oracle from which Ob. quoted antedates the 5th cent. It represents Edom as still living in the rocky fastnesses of Mt. Seir, on whose impregnable character it relies for safety, and there is no hint that it has already suffered serious reverses. And from the absence of all reference to Edom's behaviour toward Judah in 586 B.C. it would appear that the exile is not yet presupposed. If we knew which nations attacked Edom, we might perhaps be able to determine the time more definitely, but no hint about their identity is given. The older oracle may also have had the Arabians in mind, but we do not know.

In the appendix, vv. $^{15a.\,16\text{-}18}$, no historical situation is indicated which might help us fix its date more exactly. The *terminus a quo* is, of course, the latter part of the 5th cent. after the completion of Ob. $^{1\text{-}14.\,15b}$. And the *terminus ad quem* is fixed by the date of the book Joel, which is dependent on Ob. The likeness of passages in Jo. to Ob. is limited to certain phrases (*cf.* Ob. ^{10} with Jo. 4^{19}; ^{11} with 4^{3}; ^{15} with 4^{14} 1^{15} $4^{4.\,7}$; ^{17} with 3^{5} 4^{17}). But the comparison shows that Jo. knew not only the older book but also the appendix. The fact that he states in 3^5 that he quotes an older oracle, which occurs literally thus in Ob. [17], makes it almost certain that he used Ob. And since the phrase מחמס occurs with him also in a passage against Edom (4^{19}) and the infrequent phrase ידו גורל (4^3) is found also in Ob., and since Jo. adds to the phrase והיה קדש (4^{17}) a comment, the case is decided for the priority of Ob. If the date of Jo. is correctly placed between 400 and 350 B.C. this appendix must have been added some time before or soon after the beginning of the 4th cent.

Vv. [19-21] point in the same direction. If the list in vv. [19. 20] were a description of territory which Judah had already taken, it would be different. The passage would then belong to the time of Alexander Jannæus (103–76 B.C.), where Eich. actually placed it. For then all this was practically realised. Edom had been definitely conquered by John Hyrcanus, Galilee by Aristobulus I, Philistia, Moab and Gilead by Alexander Jannæus. But if there were no other reasons, the simple fact that vv. [19. 20] are an expression of hope and not a description of fact excludes this. Knowing that these verses must be later than B.C. 400 we might think of the Maccabean time, when patriotism flamed up once more and when the hope of the reconquest of the old dominion seemed not unjustifiable (We., Marti, Bart., Hpt.). But Ecclus. 49^{10} is not favourable to so late a date. And the mention of the Samaritans and Ammonites, as well as of the Philistines and Edomites, points to the age of Nehemiah or soon after. So does also the manner in which the hope of the reconquest of the ancient territory is expressed.

As a matter of historical interest Hi.'s interpretation deserves to be recorded. He thought the oracle was written in 312 B.C. in Egypt, when Antigonus ordered the expedition against Petra and Mt. Seir. The author was a Jew who had been carried off to Egypt by Ptolemy Lagi. The difficult החל הזה in v. [20] Hi. referred to the *fortress* in Egypt to which the exiles had been carried. But this date is impossible because in 312 B.C. not the Edomites but the Nabateans occupied Petra and Mt. Seir.

§ 3. THE INTERPRETATION OF THE BOOK.

Israel and Edom had been enemies as far back as they could remember. From the earliest time of their history the two nations had hated and scorned and persecuted each other. But they never forgot that they were brothers, though this seemed only to add to the intensity of their hatred.

When, therefore, one day the news came that certain nations were allying themselves for the purpose of attacking Edom, a prophet in Israel felt his heart burn with the hope that they would succeed. Doubtless all his people shared this hope. But it soon became more than a hope with him, for he became aware that Yahweh spoke to him in his innermost being and interpreted to him the significance of these events. And with the authority and power of a divine revelation upon him he spoke to his people of Yahweh's decree. In brief, strong words uttered with true literary finish he predicted Edom's defeat. Yahweh Himself was behind this movement. He Himself would throw Edom down from its height.

We do not know the outcome of this campaign or when it took place or who the attacking nations were. We do not even know who the ancient prophet was. But his message must have made a profound impression, for though his name perished, his words were not forgotten. They were taken up by two other prophets and incorporated into their writings. One of them was Obadiah.

It was after the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C., how long after we do not know, it may have been still during the exile though it is much more probable that it was over a hundred years later, when a great catastrophe befell Edom, the Nabatean invasion, as a result of which she lost her land and her possessions.

What a tumult of joy the report of this disaster excited in the hearts of the Jews! Again there was one among them who gave voice to their emotions. He remembered those clear, strong words of the ancient prophet concerning Edom's fall. It was as if they had been spoken but yesterday! Surely they were Yahweh's oracle concerning the events that had just taken place! Yahweh had said when some nations were preparing an attack upon Edom that she would go down in this war, that nothing should save her from it. If her high fortresses were even more inaccessible—yea, Ob. adds, full of exultation, if they were as high as the very stars in the sky—they would be of no avail, for behind these nations was Yahweh who would bring Edom down to the ground.—Ha! Ob. exclaims, the fall has come, and how terrible it has been! True enough, as the old prophet had said, an ordinary razzia of robbers and thieves would not account for the severity of the visitation, for oh, how terribly she had been plundered, and that, to add to her humiliation, by her own friends and former allies! They have driven her out of her strong, inaccessible mountain seats to the borders of her land! Shrewd and wary Edom had not been shrewd enough to see through their treacherous tricks, by which they prevailed over her. Ah, was not this also in fulfilment of the prophecy which had declared that on that day Yahweh would take away all wisdom from Edom in order that they might not be able to escape complete destruction? And surely, they have richly deserved this fate by their behaviour toward Judah at the time of the capture of Jerusalem by the barbarians. Oh, that awful day! As Ob. thinks of it, it suddenly stands before his mind with all its anguish and terror. He lives again through its horrors, sees the Edomites full of malicious joy over Judah's calamity, hears their words of scorn and ridicule, sees them coming into the city to loot and to plunder, sees them cutting down fugitive Jews at the crossroads, and overmastered by his emotion he breaks forth into passionate warnings, as if Edom were even now doing these things. Then he recovers himself and with one brief sentence he breaks off, *As thou hast done so is it done to thee, thy reward returns upon thine own head!* And with this note of satisfaction his words end.

Again the years passed on, how many we do not know, perhaps a hundred years, perhaps more. The Nabatean invaders had long driven Edom from Mt. Seir. But still the Edomites lived on as a nation, closer neighbours of Judah than before the exile, for they were settled in ancient Judean territory, in the South country, the Negeb, and they still cherished their hatred for their brother nation. The Jews had lost their political independence and military power and could no longer expect to punish foreign insolence by force. But they had not lost their keen sense of justice and their ardent hope that some day Yahweh would set all things right in this world and restore his nation Israel to her former glory. And again a man of patriotic heart and prophetic mind arose and gave utterance to this hope and brought the judgment of Edom into this larger connection. Formerly the great movements of history as they affected the fate of Israel could be interpreted by the prophets as parts of Yahweh's plan. There were no such movements now, no nation like the Assyrians or Babylonians, no king like Cyrus that a prophetic mind could regard as Yahweh's special instrument. Not even the Nabateans were stirring; that peril was over. But Yahweh was living still and controlling the affairs of this world, and He was just, and He was still Israel's God. This our prophet knows and believes with all the intensity of his spirit. And out of the living experience of the reality and truth of these convictions there grows afresh in his heart the hope, which becomes an assurance, that the day was near when Yahweh would righten all the affairs of this world, when He would judge all nations. It would be a terrible day. But only for the other nations not for the Jews, for they had already received their punishment at the hands of Yahweh. Through this coming awful crisis those who were still left would pass unharmed and after the catastrophe they would dwell once more safely on Mt. Zion never to be driven out again by foreign invaders. On the contrary, they themselves will then drive out the nations that had dispossessed them and taken their property. Then also Edom's turn will come, then that cruel brother Esau also will receive his reward at the hands of Jacob, who will exterminate him.

That our author proceeded to give a further explanation of how vv. [17b. 18] were to be understood, has seemed to us more likely than that he stopped here at the end of v. [18] and that somebody else wrote the continuation, when in that great time of the Maccabean uprising the national feeling ran high and the reconquest of all the territory was hoped for, and when Edom again was behaving cruelly toward Judah, however appropriate then the whole prophecy might have been. Doubtless it cheered the Jews then! All the former territory with its ideal limits would be retaken by

Israel. That meant, of course, the exiles of Israel and of Judah. They will come back and reconquer all of Palestine E. and W. of the Jordan and in the N. as far as Zarepta and in the S. including the cities of the Negeb. And they will march to Mt. Zion in order to help their brethren in their expedition *vs.* Edom. And after that the glorious day will break, when Yahweh's kingdom will be established and when He will reign alone.

There are three modes of interpreting the book of Ob. The first interprets it as a prediction of *future* events. This has been the usual interpretation up to recent years. The second interprets it as a poetic narrative of *past* events (We.); the third as a prophetic estimate of *present*, just transpiring, events (Marti). In the preceding paragraphs justice has been done to all these interpretations. The older prophet who is quoted, and the authors of the appendix spoke of the future. Ob. gave a prophetic estimate of events that had taken or were just taking place in his own time.

§ 4. THE PROPHET AND HIS BOOK.

It seems most reasonable to identify Ob. with the prophetic writer of the 5th cent. and not with the author of the older oracle from whom he quoted. The various identifications of Ob., *e. g.*, with the officer of Ahab, 1 K. $18^{3\,\mathrm{ff.}}$, or with the teacher of the law under Joshaphat, 2 Ch. 17^{7}, or with the overseer under Josiah, 2 Ch. 34^{12}, or with the anonymous prophet under Amaziah, 2 Ch. 25^{7}, are all without historical basis. We know nothing of Ob. aside from his book. Tradition varies even in regard to the pronunciation of his name. The Heb. pronounces it *Obadiah*, *worshipper of Yahweh*, the Gk. *Abdiah*, *servant of Yahweh.* It has even been suggested that it is a symbolic name for *prophet of Yahweh.* But its frequent occurrence as a common personal name makes it unsuitable for such a use. It is obvious that we cannot characterise him from the few verses that he wrote. But we are aware that his strong way of putting things, his graphic descriptions, his love for striking pictures, his quick exclamations, his impassioned warnings throbbing with anger and sorrow, made all aglow by a wonderfully vivid imagination, reveal a strong, passionate nature uncurbed by prophetic discipline and experience.

He heard Yahweh in the voice of older prophecy and of history, and on the basis of his profound belief in the consistency and justice of Yahweh he interpreted the stirring events of his time.

His vision was narrow and the conviction that justice must triumph was expressed in particularistic form. Yet it voiced the feelings of his own day and the passionate hopes of succeeding days! No wonder that a later writer readapted the little book to his time by bringing the judgment of Edom into the larger scheme of universal judgment, and that this later writer saw in it an expression of the great national hope and added his brief interpretation, so that it became a book for all times and could pass on from age to age with its burning message, ever setting hearts on fire. Small though it was, it came to be thought worthy of a place in the canon. And again and again when their enemies oppressed them, the Jews would turn to it for consolation. After Edom had perished, it became the type of Israel's foes. The name of the enemies changed; first the Romans, then the Christians became the Edomites for the Jews! And ever through the long centuries did this little book, which contained no wonderful vision and no great word, voice the stifled cry for vengeance as it rose from the heart of the oppressed people, and, Jewish to its core, it fed the hungry soul of the suffering people again and again with the hope that the day of vengeance was coming and that the day of triumph was at hand! The voice was so eager, so insistent, so full of throbbing passion that it compelled them to listen. And though the hope it inspired was selfish and far below Israel's highest vision, it made it possible for many Jews to go on believing in the moral government of the world, in the justice of their God. Ay, the pathos of the little book!

Ob. follows directly upon Amos in the Heb. Canon. But this position is not due to historical considerations but to the reference to Edom in the conclusion of Am. The book of Ob. appeared to the editor to be an expansion of Am. 9^{12} and so he put it after Am. Schnurrer showed this already in 1787 (*Dissertatio philologica in Obadiam*). It is therefore surprising that Ew. should regard the position in the canon important for fixing the date of the older oracle (*Urobadja*). Bu. suggests that Ob. may have been inserted into the proph. canon not only because Edom could not be passed over but in order to fill up the number twelve.

§ 5. THE TEXT.

The text of Ob. is, on the whole, in good condition. About the textcritical aid of the Vrss. nothing special for Ob. need be said. But in connection with the use of the parall. passage in Je. 49 it must constantly be kept in mind that our aim is to restore the text of Ob.; not the text of the orig. oracle from which Ob. quoted, but the form of the text which Ob. wrote down. Just as in an OT. quotation in Paul's letters we do not restore the reading of 𝔊, if he does not quote exactly, because we want Paul's way of quoting it, so in Ob. we may note his variations from the quoted oracle but must not substitute such readings unless we are certain that the variants in Ob. are not due to Ob. himself but to corruption. The restoration of the original oracle underlying Ob. and Je. is an entirely different task.

An interesting, though unconvincing, reconstruction of this older source by the aid of the metre was presented in *ThStK.*, 1907, pp. 315–43, by H. Bekel, *Ein vorexilisches Orakel über Edom in der Klageliederstrophe—die gemeinsame Quelle von Obadja* 1–9 *und Jeremia* 49, 7–22. *Ein Beitrag zur Lösung des Verwandtschaftsproblems in beiden Texten.*

§ 6. THE METRE.

The prophets wrote their messages in rhythmic form and the recognition of their metrical scheme is of great importance for textual and literary criticism. This holds true of the book of Ob. also. And we observe that an arrangement of its rhythmic structure, which suggests itself naturally and which requires no artificial reconstruction, corroborates our literary results. It shows that Ob. did quote from an older oracle in the first section, that he himself preferred the pentameter movement and that he used it wherever he did not feel himself bound to the metrical structure of the older oracle, as is clear from those verses in which he gives his own interpretation, as in vv. [6. 7. 12–14]. Indeed, even in his quotation from the older oracle, vv. [3aβ. 4] are a tetrastich of pentameters owing to his modifications. Notice also the pentameter which introduces the quotation in v. [8].—The different metrical structure of the appendix points to its secondariness, and the irregularity of vv. [15a. 16-21] to the fact that the author has collected several originally not connected elements into this section.

The metrical and strophical form of Ob. has only in recent years received close attention. Eich. had indeed printed his transl. in metre as early as 1819, being convinced that the addresses of the prophets were always rhythmic, and Bu. had shown (*ZAW.*, 1882, p. 34) that vv. [6. 7] and [12-14], and also (*ZAW.*, 1883, pp. 305 *f.*) v. [7b] are in *ḳinah*-measure. But Con. was the first to take up the problem as a whole in 1900. His main interest was to prove the unity of Ob. by the strophical arrangement of the oracle. He used Zenner's artificial chorus-theory with its strophes and antistrophes and presented a very regular scheme, with natural and effective divisions. But that these were *intended* as strophes and antistrophes he did not show. And even if it could be shown, how can the strophical arrangement alone be sufficient to prove the unity of the book, when other arguments are opposed to it? In contrast to Con., Siev. (1901) treated not the strophic structure but the rhythmic form which Con. had neglected. He showed in a careful contribution that the oracle is rhythmic throughout, but with little regularity.—JMPS. (1906) used both metr. and stroph. considerations as means for textual and literary criticism. While Con. had tried to prove the unity, Smith tried to show by the use of the metr. and stroph. structure that the book is composite. According to him it consists of three elements which are "not vitally related to one another" and which "differ in form, in thought, in point of view and in spirit." They are: A, vv. [1-7a. 10. 11. 15b], composed of five six-line trimeter strophes, B, vv. [12-14], one six-line *ḳinah* or pentameter movement, C, vv. [15a. 16-21], composed of three strophes of 4, 8 and 8 lines respectively, with broken rhythm, varying between trimeter and tetrameter. And besides these "the fragment, vv. [8-9]," a five-line strophe. Smith's stroph. arrangement is less natural than Con.'s, and in his endeavour to get strophes of uniform length he has to reconstruct the text quite freely. On vv. [12-14], *v. i.* In the same year (1906) Now. published a careful metr. and textcrit. edition which forms the best basis for further investigation along these lines. In 1907 Siev. tried to show with the aid of the metre that the book is composed of four originally unrelated sections: I, vv. [3b. 4. 5d. 5a. 5c. 2. 3a. 5b. 6. 7] in pentameter form, II, vv. [1bβα. 1c. 1bα. 10-14. 15b] in heptameter form, III, vv. [16. 17. 18] in heptameters followed by trimeters, IV, vv. [19-21] in heptameters. I is most likely the orig. oracle. II and III were probably two originally independent pieces which originated under similar circumstances, III being more likely a fragment of a larger piece than an appendix to II. IV is a later appendix. In the deletion of secondary elements Siev. follows We., Now. and Marti, but wherever his metr. reconstruction requires it he goes beyond them. Thus he omits, *e. g.*, all the negatives in vv. $^{12-14}$, which is textcritically unjustifiable. In order to get a regular scheme he resorts to transpositions (in I and II) which cannot be naturally explained, and ignores the one principle of Heb. metre, the parall. of the lines, which has so long been regarded as fundamental (*cf.*, *e. g.*, vv. $^{10-14}$). Nevertheless, Siev.'s contribution is of great value for the rhythm. In 1909 Marti published a transl. in which he expressed the textcrit., literary and metr. results of his commentary. It occupies essentially the same position as Now.^{K}, but treats vv. $^{19-21}$ also as metrical.—Kent's metr. translation of 1910 is somewhat marred by the representation of vv. $^{12-14}$.—The most recent metr. transl. is that by Du. (1910) in which he represents vv. $^{1-15}$ (without the add. of vv. $^{3b.\ 7b\beta.\ 8.\ 9.\ 13a\beta.\ 15a}$) in 14 stanzas of two distichs each, apparently, in pentameter movement. The appendix he prints as prose. The metrical scheme of Ob. is, however, not as regular as Du. would lead one to believe and in so far his transl. does not represent the metre of the original.

§ 7. MODERN LITERATURE.

(1) *Commentators dealing with all the Minor Prophets.*—Eichhorn, 1819; Ewald, ^{2} 1868 (Engl., 1875); Hitzig, ^{3} 1843; Hitzig-Steiner, ^{4} 1881; Pusey, 1861; Keil, ^{2} 1873 (Engl., 1880), ^{3} 1888; von Orelli, 1888 (Engl., 1893), ^{3} 1908; Wellhausen, 1892, ^{3} 1898; G. A. Smith, 1897–98; Nowack, 1898, ^{2} 1903; Marti, 1903, van Hoonacker, 1908.

(2) *Special commentaries on Obadiah.*—P. C. Caspari, *Der Prophet Obadja*, 1842. Kleinert, in Lange's *Bibelwerk*, 1868 (Engl., 1875). Norbert Peters, *Die Prophetie Obadjahs*, 1892. T. T. Perowne, *Obadiah and Jonah*, in the Cambridge Bible, 1889. Wynkoop, in Abr. Kahana's *Biblia Hebraica*, 1906 (Hebrew). Halévy, *Le Livre d'Obadia*, in his *Recherches Bibliques*, IV, 1907, pp. 452–70. Marti, in Kautzsch's *Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments*, ^{3} 1909. Kent, *Students' Old Testament*, III, 1910. The last two give a translation and brief notes.

(3) *Special articles.*—Winckler, *AOF*, Zweite Reihe, Band III, Heft 1, 1900, pp. 425–32, Heft 2, 1901, p. 455. Selbie, in *DB.*,

III, 1900. Cheyne, in *EB.*, III, 1902. Barton, in *JE.*, IX, 1905. Bruston, *Les plus anciens Prophètes. Étude Critique*, 1907. G. B. Gray, in *Hastings's* one vol. ed., 1909. G. A. Peckham, *Introduction to the Study of Obadiah*, 1910. See also the Introductions, esp. those by Driver, ^{8} 1909; König, 1893; Cornill, ^{5} 1905; and Budde, *Geschichte der althebraïschen Litteratur*, 1906, and *Das Prophetische Schrifttum*, 1906.

(4) *The text and metre.*—Vollers, *Das Dodekapropheton der Alexandriner*, *ZAW.*, IV, 1884, pp. 16 *ff.* Sebök, *Die Syrische Übersetzung der zwölf kleinen Propheten*, 1887. Graetz, *Emendationes in plerosque sacræ Scripturæ Veteris Testamenti libros*, II, 1893. Ehrlich, *Mikrâ ki-Pheschutô*, III, 1901. Cheyne, *Critica Biblica*, II, 1903. Oesterley, *Codex Taurinensis* (Y), *JTS.*, VII, 1906, pp. 518 *ff.* Nowack, in Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*, 1906. Condamin, *L'Unité d'Abdias*, *RB.*, IX, 1900, pp. 261–68. Sievers, *Metrische Studien*, I, 1901, pp. 479–82, and *Alttestamentliche Miscellen*, VII, pp. 38–49, in Berichte über d. Verhandl. d. Kgl. Sächs. Ges. d. Wissensch., 59 Band, 1907. J. M. P. Smith, *The Structure of Obadiah*, *AJSL.*, XXII, 1906, pp. 131–38. Duhm, *Die Zwölf Propheten in den Versmassen der Urschrift übersetzt*, 1910.

(5) *Edom.*—Buhl, *Die Geschichte der Edomiter*, 1893. C. C. Torrey, *The Edomites in Southern Judah*, *JBL.*, XVII, 1898, pp. 16–20. F. H. Vincent, *Les Nabatéens*, *RB.*, VII, 1898, pp. 567–88. Baudissin, in PRE.^{3}, V, 1898. Sayce, *DB.*, II, 1899. Nöldeke, *EB.*, II, 1910. Brünnow und v. Domaszewski, *Die Provincia Arabia*, I, 1904. Libbey and Hoskins, *The Jordan Valley and Petra*, 2 vols., 1905. Musil, *Arabia Petraea*, II, 1908. Dalman, *Petra und seine Felsenheiligtümer*, 1908. G. A. Smith, *The Land of Edom*, *Exp.*, beginning Oct., 1908 *ff.*

COMMENTARY ON OBADIAH.

The title, *the Vision of Obadiah*, does not give time, home or father's name of the prophet. *Vision* is a technical name for prophecy, referring to the divine communication received in the ecstatic state. Later it referred esp. to the eschatological drama which formed its contents. Here, as in Is. 1[1], Na. 1[1], it is used as the title of a book. The introd., *thus saith the Lord Yahweh concerning Edom*, with its emphasis on the sovereignty of Yahweh (*cf.* Am. 7[1] 8[1]) may be intended either for the whole oracle or, better, only for the older oracle which is quoted in vv. [1 ff.].

Vv. 1–4. *An older oracle had declared when certain nations were allying themselves for war against Edom that the outcome would be Edom's downfall. Nothing would save her; even if her impregnable fortresses were still stronger, they would be of no avail, because Yahweh Himself would bring Edom down.*

> On the older oracle and Ob.'s relation to Je. see Intro. Since Ob. quotes here we may take the impf. in v. [4], *I will bring her down*, as referring to the fut. and the pfs. in vv. [2. 3] as proph. pfs., even though in later verses Ob. speaks of the past. Those who do not perceive that Ob. is quoting see in vv. [1-4] a description of past (We.) or of just transpiring events (Marti).

1. *We have heard an audition*, or *oracle*, may also be translated, *We have heard a report* or *tidings* (RV.). But then the phrase *from Yahweh* is without point, for it is not the news of the formation of an alliance that has been received from Yahweh, but the oracle in vv. [2-4] which interprets the significance of this historic movement. And so the foll. sentence, *and a messenger was sent among the nations*, is neither grammatically or logically dependent on *we have heard*, but marks the circumstance, and should therefore be translated by *when* or *while a messenger was being sent among the nations*. Only thus is v. [1] a natural introduction to v. [2]. A messenger, or messengers (coll. sg.), is going from country to country trying to persuade the various nations to join an alliance against Edom. This is still going on—for the parall. in Je. 49 gives the more forceful and better interpretation by reading *sent* as a prtc.—when Yahweh suddenly reveals to his prophet that He is behind the movement (vv. [2-4]). Acc. to the better text of Je. 49 this was revealed to the proph. alone in an audition: *I have heard.* It is the prophets and not the people in general that are the recipients of the divine revelation and interpretation of historic events (*cf.* Am. 3[7] Is. 5[9]). In the Heb. text of Ob. it is, however, not the proph. alone but also the people, for it reads WE *have heard.* Since they cannot all have had an audition we seem forced to translate *hearing* by *rumor*, but if we do this, v. [1] stands in no immediate connection with v. [2]. The reading WE *have heard* is therefore inferior, as not only Je. 49 but also 𝔊 in our text shows. When the proph. received the revelation he did not see in his ecstatic state the messenger, one of the heavenly beings, who was to go to the nations, nor did he hear the message which Yahweh commanded him to give. For the messenger was no angel, nor are we told that he was sent by Yahweh, though 𝔊 interprets thus. He was human and sent by some nation, for he identifies himself with the nations to which he goes. All this is clear when the circumstantial character of the clause *when a messenger was being sent among the nations* is recognised. Who these *nations* were is left unsaid. *Cf.* on v. [7]. Nor do we know which nation was the soul of the confederacy. The purport of the message is summarised in direct speech. It is due to the excitement or rather to the rhythmic movement of the sentences in the orig. that it is not introduced by *saying;* similarly, *e. g.*, Is. 3[6. 14]. The messenger's call to a military alliance for the purpose of overthrowing Edom, *Rise ye, and let us rise up against her for war!* reads somewhat differently and more nearly as the older oracle in Je. 49[14], *Gather yourselves together, and come against her, and rise up for war!* The dramatic element in this brief, graphic description should not be overlooked. The name of the nation against which the alliance is formed is not given. The people to whom the messenger spoke knew, of course, who was meant. And we know it from the heading both in Ob. and in Je., and also from the description of the mountain people in the foll. verses which can only refer to Edom. It is strange that the messenger says against *her*, when all through the rest of the book Edom is masc. We should probably restore the masc., but he may have thought of the land (fem.) rather than of the people (masc.).—So far all is introd., giving the hist. circumstances. Now the oracle begins. Yahweh explains the underlying significance of this alliance. It is in line with his purpose concerning Edom. He Himself is behind the movement. The nations are but His instruments.

2. *Behold, I will make thee small among the nations.* The pf. is to be translated by the fut., because it is the proph. pf. It is so certain that he points to it, *behold!* as if it were already accomplished. *The nations* are here all the nations, not merely the ones referred to in v. [1]. Thus the parall. in Je. 49[15] reads *among men* for Ob.'s more orig. *exceedingly.* Scorn is added to humiliation, making the misfortune more bitter.—**3.** But Edom is full of defiance. She thinks her mountain fortresses invincible and makes light of the threatening danger. But this time she is mistaken. *The pride of thy heart has deceived thee.* The subj. stands in an emphatic position and the term used is very forcible. *O thou that dwellest in the clefts of the rock!* The rock (*selah*) may be either the rocks of Mt. Seir in general (sg. coll.) or it may have special reference to the capital *Selah*, the later Petra. *That makest high thy habitation.* A slight change in the vocalisation of the text has been adopted on the authority of the Vrss. 𝔐 reads *the height of his habitation*, *v. i.* The natural strongholds of the high cliffs of Mt. Seir and esp. of Petra have been frequently described by travellers. Nature itself appeared to justify Edom's proud self-reliance. No wonder that he thinks or, as the Heb. puts it, *says in his heart* (for to the Heb. the heart is the seat of the intellect as well as of emotion and volition), *Who shall bring me down to the ground?* A proud, defiant question! Je. 49 does not have this graphic sentence, but it must not, therefore, be omitted in Ob.—**4.** What an unexpected reply there comes! *Though thou mount high as the eagle*, higher than any other bird (Jb. 39[27 f.] Pr. 23[5]), *yea, though thou set thy nest among the stars*, even *thence will I bring thee down, saith Yahweh.* *Cf.* Am. 9[2 ff.] Is. 14[13 ff.]. The parall. in Je. 49 omits *yea, though thou set thy nest among the stars* and reads *though thou* *buildest thy nest as high as the eagle, I will bring thee down thence.* Ob. makes this more forcible. Edom's seats are even now on the high cliffs where the eagles build their nests, and they may well seem inaccessible, but if Edom should soar as high as the eagle and build her nest in the very sky, where the eagle only flies but does not nest, even there she would not be safe, *even thence will I bring thee down, says Yahweh.* The additions in vv. [3. 4] show the vivid imagination and intense feeling of Ob.

5–7. *This older oracle has been fulfilled. The fall from the height has come. Ha! how completely Edom has just been cleaned out! How thoroughly her rich treasure-stores have just been rifled! And she herself has been driven from her impregnable seats to the border of her country. Former allies have done it by treachery which Edom was too stupid to see through!*

Clearly a fresh beginning is made here. This is no longer merely a quotation from an older oracle. The vividness of the exclamations, the use of the past tenses and esp. the detailed description in v. [7] show that Ob. describes now with some of the terms of the old oracle its fulfilment in the ruin of Edom which had taken place in his own time. Edom, in vv. [1-4], still proud and defiant in her ancient seats on Mt. Seir, has been driven from these strongholds and has lost all her great riches (vv. [6. 7]).

Grammatically the pfs. in these verses may, of course, be either hist., describing past or present events, or proph., describing the future with an assurance as if it were already past. The use of one impf. at the end of v. [7], *they lay*, or *shall lay, snares under thee*, might seem to point to the latter cstr., if it could not just as well be transl. *they kept setting traps* (GASm.). It does, therefore, not decide the question in favour of the predictive interpretation. The material for a decision is given by the relation of the verses to the orig. oracle. The comparison with the parall. in Je. 49 (*cf.* p. 35 *f.*), shows that Ob. utilises portions of the old oracle but modifies the prediction to a hist. retrospect and finally describes the fulfilment in words of his own. In Je. the *prediction* is still preserved, in Ob. the prediction has become *history.*

The details of the description of the hist. situation are not quite certain. Who the enemies are, we are not told. They are not necessarily the same enemies in vv. [5-7] that the older proph., from whom Ob. quoted, was speaking of in v. [1], for Ob. lived, of course, later. We do not know whom the older proph. referred to, nor are we sure whom Ob. meant, though he defines them as former friends and allies. This might refer to Moab and Ammon, but no hist. tradition has been preserved that they defeated Edom in postexilic times. It is much rather the Arabians, as

We. has shown, who pressed upon the Edomites from the beginning of the 6th cent. on and who eventually drove them out of their territory toward the north, so that we find in 312 B.C. the ancient seat of Edom, Mt. Seir, in the hands of the Nabateans—while the Edomites were dwelling in the Negeb, into which they had poured after the Bab. exile had depopulated Jerusalem and the Judean cities and left them at the mercy of their neighbours.

Note that Ob., in harmony with the hist. situation just outlined, speaks of the thorough plundering and dispossession of Edom, not of its absolute extermination. The terms of the older oracle, preserved in Je. 49[10b], were too strong for him.

5–7. The thought of v. [5] gets its full significance from the foll. Thieves would steal only as much as they want and vintagers would leave gleanings, but how fearfully has Edom been plundered! Thieves or robbers can never have done that! The orig. continuation of the thought is preserved in Je., where we read that *Yahweh* was the author of the catastrophe. Ob.'s continuation in v. [7] is in the nature of a hist. commentary. Not thieves or robbers by night but the treachery of former friends and allies has brought on this calamity.—**5.** The phrase *robbers by night* was added by Ob. in his free quotation, and should not be omitted from the Ob. text. The exclamation *how art thou destroyed*, however, comes in so abruptly, tearing apart the closely connected clauses of the sentence, that some have regarded it as a gloss, others as misplaced. It is not in Je. 49[7] and forms no part of the older oracle. If it voices Ob.'s own strong emotion, as is most likely, it prob. stood orig. at the beginning of v. [5], and was Ob.'s introd. exclamation to his hist. commentary. The fall from the height has indeed come, *How art thou destroyed!* or, *how art thou thrown down!* 𝔊. The comparison of Edom's spoilers with vintagers must have suggested itself almost inevitably, because of the many fine vineyards on Mt. Seir. *Vintagers* were not only in the habit of leaving gleanings, but were even forbidden by law, in the interest of the poor (Dt. 24[21]), to go through the vines a second time. Thus the gleanings are repeatedly used as an apt comparison for the remnant.

6. *How is Esau searched out!* Again one of those exclamations of Ob. over the magnitude of the disaster! The Obadian character of it is brought out not only by a reference to the other in v. [5]

but also by a comparison with Je. 49, where the calmer and more logical reading of the orig. oracle is preserved. Esau is used for Edom, as Jacob for Israel. The Edomites, who were very wealthy as a result of their trade, had hidden their treasures acc. to the old custom (Is. 45[3] Pr. 2[4] Jb. 3[21]) in secret and inaccessible places, in safes hewn in the rocks (Diodorus Siculus 19[94. 95]). Now all these are rifled!—**7.** Ob. interprets the catastrophe as the fulfilment of the old oracle and he gives the explanation which complements vv. [5 f.]. The catastrophe is due to former friends and allies, most probably the Nabateans, *v. s.* They have *driven* the Edomites *to the border* of their country, and cast them out of their ancient seats of which they themselves took possession.* The allies are called in Heb. *the men of thy covenant*, who were bound to the Edomites by the sacred bonds of a treaty or covenant, also the men *of thy peace*, *i. e.*, *friends*. The sentence *Thy friends have deceived thee, prevailed over thee*, is an almost exact, though not necessarily conscious, quotation from one of Jeremiah's own dirges (Je. 38[22]); only a synonym for *deceived* is used there. The exact significance of *prevailed over thee* is gained from the context, they prevailed not so much by force as by trickery. The bracketed words in [*They that eat*] *thy bread*, AV., RV., and [*the men of*] *thy bread*, AV.[m], are not in the Heb. If correctly supplied the meaning is clear from Ps. 41[10], where *the man of thy covenant* is parall. to *he that eats thy bread*. Eating bread with a Semite meant entering into fellowship with him, a custom still prevalent in the bread and salt covenant. But the text is not certain. The word translated *thy bread* is not 𝔊, and may therefore be a variant of *thy peace; men of thy peace = men of thy bread*. But it is more probable that it should be emended very slightly so as to read, *to discomfit thee they have kept laying snares*, tripping thee up and bringing thee to fall. The tense expresses the continued or reiterated action in the past. The translation *snare* (RV.), though not altogether certain, is after all the most probable. See text. n. *Under thee* is not idiomatic and therefore the consonants should be differently pointed and divided, *and thou wast dismayed, for there was no understanding in thee.* The text reads *in him*, but it must have orig. been *in thee*, because the 2d pers. is used throughout the verse. This clause is omitted by some as a marg. note, and transposed into v. [8] by others. Details of the trickery are not given.

---

* The first three words of v. [7] are capable of several interpretations. Lit., they read *unto the border have they sent thee*. This may mean (1) *they have brought thee on thy way, even to the border*, RV., which has been variously explained as meaning either that the allies accompanied the Edomites to the border to leave them there at the mercy of their enemies, or to attack and plunder them there; or that they escorted the ambassadors of Edom politely to the border without, however, giving them aid. Or it may mean (2) *they have sent thee away*, *i. e.*, the Edomitish fugitives who came to find refuge with their friends. Or it may mean (3) *they have driven thee out, even to the border*, RV.[m], *i. e.*, the Edomites have been driven to the border of their land by their former friends and allies. On the whole this last interpretation is the best. It is true that the Heb. word for *driving out* is not as strong as we should expect, but the weaker word was prob. used with intention, because the foll. shows that Edom's fall was not so much due to force as to treachery.

Vv. 8–9. *Is not this in fulfilment of the prophecy which had declared that Yahweh would take away Edom's wisdom in order to destroy her utterly?*

> The last clause, *because there was no understanding in thee*, has reminded Ob. of the older oracle. Had it not said just this, that Yahweh would stultify, at the time of the impending catastrophe, all the wise men of Edom, so that none would be able to devise a means of deliverance and every single Edomite should perish? Yes, they were to be destroyed completely and, indeed, they *ought* to be because of their cruel behaviour toward their brother nation Judah at the time of her distress. On the authenticity of these verses, see p. 36.

8. The decree of Yahweh is introduced in a rhetorical fashion, lit., *Was it not in that day?*—said the old oracle—*that I would destroy wisdom from Edom.* The Heb. has *wise men* but the parall. *and understanding from Mt. Esau* suggests the reading *wisdom.* This presupposes a slighter change than the alternate suggestion which changes *understanding* to *men of understanding*, though the meaning is the same. Similar phraseology is applied to Judah in Is. 29[14] so that it is not permissible to argue only from this that Edom was famous for her wise men. *That day* is here not the day of universal judgment, as in v. [15], but of Edom's judgment. *Mt. Esau* is used only in Ob. [8. 9. 19. 21], usually it is *Mt. Seir.*—**9.** *So that thy heroes, O Teman, should be dismayed.* If not merely a scribal error, the sudden change to the direct address is due to Ob.'s manner of quoting. The older oracle seems to have used the 3d pers., *cf.* Je. 49[7]. But Ob. had addressed Edom throughout and so he naturally falls into the direct address here, where he does not quote very literally. On *Teman*, *cf.* Am. 1[11]. It was a northern district of Edom (Ez. 25[13]). But nothing can be deduced from its northerly situation in regard to the direction from which the attacking enemies came, for it stands here for Edom in general (*cf.* Je. 49[22]), *the heroes of Edom*, and is used here because it was contained in the old oracle (*cf.* Je. 49[7]). Nobody will defend the country and the *result* will be the total destruction of Edom. This is described as Yahweh's *purpose* in robbing them of their wisdom and valour, *in order that everybody might be cut off from Mt. Esau. By slaughter* is joined by 𝔊, 𝔏 and many scholars to the next verse. But this gives an inferior combination, the stronger word preceding the weaker. It goes well with v. [9], and the metre favours this.

10–11. *They have richly deserved this terrible punishment, because of their brutal behaviour toward their brother nation Judah* (v. [10]) *at the time when Jerusalem was taken by the barbarians* (v. [11]).

10. *Because of the violence done to thy brother Jacob.* Edom and Israel were brother nations and never forgot their kinship. *Cf.* Dt. 23[7]. Yet they often fought each other with hot, relentless hatred. *Cf.* Am. 1[11]. The name *Jacob* refers here, as Jo. 4[19] correctly interprets, to Judah; it is used to set into sharp relief the heinous character of Edom's guilt; he inflicted violence on his *brother!* For this reason *shame covers thee and thou shalt be cut off forever!* All hope of a final restoration is excluded.—**11.** Edom's acts of violence were committed at the time of the capture of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans in 586 B.C., *when thou stoodest by*, or *aloof*, without helping thy brother, *when* (so 𝔐 reads) *strangers carried away his* (*i. e.*, his brother Jacob's) *forces* or *substance.* The Heb. word may mean either *forces* (sg. coll., AV., RV.[m]) or *substance*, wealth (RV.). The former is favoured by the usage of the vb. which is employed with it, for it means *to take* or *carry away*, *captive*, and is used of living beings, men or animals. The latter is favoured by v. [13]. But the continuation *and foreigners entered his gates and cast the lot over Jerusalem* to apportion among themselves the captives and the booty, makes the clause in either translation appear premature. We read, therefore, with a slight emendation, *when strangers broke down his bar, and*—so he continues—*foreigners entered his gate and* *cast lots over Jerusalem* (*v. i.*). The casting of the lot was a religious function, the deity being supposed to direct the outcome.

12–14. 15b. *How malicious and cruel Edom was at that time toward his brother! Ah, but now vengeance has come, he has received his due recompense!*

> Ob.'s intense feeling throws the description of Edom's behaviour into the form of imvs. They do not refer to the fut. but to the past which the vivid imagination of the prophet conjures up. 𝔗 perceived this, for it joined vv. $^{12-14}$ directly to v. ^{11} as additional description by omitting the negatives. But it would be a mistake to infer, as, *e. g.*, Siev. does, that the orig. Heb. did not contain them. There is no explanation for their later introduction, while their omission can easily be accounted for. Moreover, while the omission produces an easier text and in general gives the correct meaning, it does away with the personal, anxious element which is so clearly genuine.

12. 𝔐 reads *gloat not over the day of thy brother*, *the day of his misfortune*, but it is better to read with a slight emendation *as a barbarian* instead of *the day of his misfortune*. This brings it in direct relation with the preceding (*v. i.*). The brief sentences and the slightly varied repetition of *the day of his calamity* (*cf.* Ez. 35^{5}) are very effective. The short warnings give a vivid picture of Edom's behaviour at the time of Jerusalem's fall. They *gloated* over their own brother, *rejoiced* with malicious joy over his disaster, *made* their *mouths large* with laughter and taunts (Ez. $35^{13.\ 15}$). —**13.** They *entered into the gate* of Jerusalem, *behaved wickedly* (*cf.* text. n.) and *stretched out their hand to its wealth*, looting and plundering.—**14.** *They stood at the breaches*, or, better, *at the partings of the ways*, which they knew much better than the Babylonians (Cal.), *to cut down* the *fugitives* or treacherously to *deliver them up* to their merciless enemies. But nobody can do such things with impunity, for to the Jewish proph. the world is controlled by a righteous God.—**15b.** The requital has come *as thou hast done, is it done to thee, thy recompense returns on thine own head!* The impf. refers to what has just been happening. *Cf.* Je. $50^{15.\ 29}$ with v. ^{15b}; Jo. $4^{4.\ 7}$ (La. 3^{64}) with v. $^{15b\beta}$.

The Appendix (vv. $^{15a.\ 16-21}$) brings the message of Ob. into the larger connection of the day of Yahweh, which will be a day of judgment for the nations and esp. for Edom, but of triumph for the Jews.

> It has grown out of an entirely different historical situation. Edom, closer neighbour to Judah than ever, had not ceased hating or annoying Judah. But there was no sign of redress. The Nabatean invasion had long been a thing of the past, and at the time of the writer there was nowhere a movement that might seem to be directed against Edom. And so he could only hope for the day of Yahweh's judgment on all nations, of which the judgment of Edom was to be a part. And as he longed with yearning passion the great hope became a certainty in him that Yahweh's day was near at hand.

Vv. 15a 16–18. *The day of Yahweh is at hand when all the nations must drink the cup of his fury. The Jews indeed need not be afraid, for they have already received their punishment, and those of them that have escaped shall dwell on Mt. Zion without fear of ever again being driven out by foreign invaders. On the contrary, they will drive out those nations that had dispossessed them and more esp. Edom, which Jacob and Joseph, acc. to Yahweh's decree, will completely destroy.*

15a. As the text now stands the thought of the nearness of the day of Yahweh with its swift requital of wickedness (*cf.* Jo. 1^{15} 2^{1}) should have restrained Edom from its cruel behaviour at the time of Jerusalem's fall. But this connection is secondary. V. ^{15a} does not belong with the preceding but with vv. $^{16\,ff.}$; it appears to be an ed. link between vv.$^{1-14.\ 15b}$ and vv. $^{16\,ff.}$.—**16.** The Jews are now addressed, no longer the Edomites. *For as ye have drunk upon my holy mountain.* The speaker is Yahweh. The change of address is indicated only by the use of the 2d pers. pl. and is so abrupt that many, from the earliest times on, have overlooked or denied the change altogether, *cf.* 𝔊. They interpret the drinking on Mt. Zion by the carousing and revelling of the Edomites in Jerusalem after the plundering of the holy city. But that this cannot be the meaning is clear from the foll. where *so shall all the nations drink* can only refer to the drinking of the cup of Yahweh's wrath. It is the striking figure derived from the vision of Jeremiah (ch. 25), which symbolises the terrible punishment inflicted by Yahweh. *Cf.* also Je. 49^{12}. The abrupt change of address would be obviated, if we translated with a very slight change, For as *my people* have drunk upon my holy mountain. But perhaps this is not necessary. The Jews have already drunk the cup of Yahweh's fury, on the great judgment day *all the nations shall drink.* It is strange that they are to drink *continually*, for there must be an end of the drinking, when they have fallen into a heavy stupor and are *as though they had not been.* If orig., the writer intended probably to express the continued punishment of the nations with the implication "that the turn never passes from the heathen to Judah (Is. $51^{22.\ 23}$)" (Hi.), or, better, that all the nations *without exception* shall drink (Ehr.). But the word is textcritically not quite certain, 𝔊 reads *wine*, many Heb. mss. read *round about* (*cf.* Zc. 12^{2}); and many scholars have followed the one or the other. But it is perhaps more likely that the text read originally either *my fury* (*cf.* Jb. 6^{4}) or *the cup from my hand.* See crit. n. *And they shall be swallowed up*, perish or (acc. to We.'s emendation) *reel, stagger* (*cf.* La. 4^{21}), *and they shall be as though they had not been*, disappearing completely.—**17.** For Judah the day of Yahweh has no terrors, for she has already passed through the purifying judgment as a result of which only a remnant is left who shall dwell in Mt. Zion. *Cf.* Is. 4^{2} 37^{32}. This is *the escape* technically so called in connection with the day of Yahweh, the abstr. noun is used for the concr. *escaped ones. And it* (Mt. Zion) *shall be holiness*, or a sanctuary, *i. e.*, inviolable, as Jo. 4^{17} correctly interprets, *and strangers shall not again pass through her.* See also Is. 52^{1} Zc. 9^{8}. The clause is grammatically a little awkward, but this slight unevenness in a passage like this is not enough to justify the rejection of the clause as secondary. *And they of the house of Jacob shall possess* (*again*) *their possessions*, their former territory. This is the reading of 𝔐 which is commented on in vv. $^{19.\ 20}$. But it does not lead over to v. ^{18} as the writer of v. ^{17} evidently intended, for he would hardly leave v. ^{18} unrelated in the context. This is done by the slightly different vocalisation of the Vrss. which read *and they of the house of Jacob shall dispossess their dispossessors* and mean by the dispossessors esp. the Edomites who took the Negeb after the fall of Jerusalem. *Cf.* Ez. 35^{10}, where the Edomites say, *These two nations and these two countries shall be mine and we* *will possess it* (the same vb. as here). This reading connects v. [13] with vv. [16. 17], while the reading *their possessions* leaves v. [18] so entirely unrelated that it interrupts the connection between v. [17b] and v. [19].—**18.** Then shall Israel, not another, so utterly destroy Edom that not a single Edomite shall escape. *Cf.* vv. [8. 9]. It seemed only just that Israel should be the avenger. This was also Ezekiel's hope (25[14]). That our proph. thought of the N. and S. kingdoms respectively is certain from vv. [19. 20], if they are by him, for there he interprets *the house of Jacob* and *the house of Joseph* by the exiles of Judah and of Israel. For the figurative expression of swift and total destruction, see also Is. 5[24] 10[17] 47[14] Zc. 12[6] Mal. 3[19]. The rhythmic ease and beauty as well as the whole tone of these lines indicate that they were adopted from some earlier prophet. The quotation-phrase *for Yahweh has spoken* points in the same direction. In any case this final clause expresses that the prediction is not only the writer's own passionate wish but Yahweh's own decree, and as such certain to be fulfilled.

19–21. The second section of the appendix gives a historical explanation of vv. [17. 18]. V. [17] had said that the house of Jacob would dispossess all its dispossessors. This means, so these verses explain, that all the old territory in its ideal boundary lines will again come back to Israel. *The Negeb, now in the hands of the Edomites, the Shephelah, now occupied by the Philistines, Mt. Ephraim, now the territory of the Samaritans, and Gilead which is now Ammonitish, all shall belong once more to Israel* (v. [19]). *For the exiles will come back and reconquer the land. The Israelitish exiles will occupy their territory as far north as Ṣar^{e}phath and the Judean exiles theirs in the south including the cities of the Negeb* (v. [20]). *They will come and march to Mt. Zion to help their brethren punish Edom. Then the golden time of Yahweh's reign will begin* (v. [21]).

19–20 are a commentary on vv. [17b. 18]. They give a list of the territories which shall be reconquered by what is left of *the house of Jacob* and *the house of Joseph* of v. [18], *i. e.*, the exiles of the N. and S. kingdoms.—**19.** Owing to a grammatical peculiarity v. [19] has been variously explained. As the text now stands the Negeb, Mt. Seir, the Shephelah, Philistia, the territory of Ephraim including

Samaria and Gilead are mentioned. The Edomites had taken advantage of the deportation of the Jews after 586 B.C. to seize the S. part of Judah, the *Negeb* (Ez. $35^{10.\,12}$ 36^{2}), which adjoined their own territory in the N., and they continued to occupy it for centuries. Hebron was still Edomitish in Maccabean times (1 Mac. 5^{65}). So the writer (others think a glossator) added the explanatory statement *Mount Esau*, to *the Negeb*. The Shephelah was the W. and SW. tract of Judah, the low hills between the high central range and the maritime plain. The boundary line between Judah and Philistia was not always clearly defined. After 586 B.C. the Philistines occupied more or less of the Shephelah. *Cf.* 1 Mac. 5^{66}. The writer added therefore to *the Shephelah* the explanation *the Philistines*. Such explanatory statements are not unusual. *Cf.* Ez. 4^{1} 36^{12}. *The fields of Ephraim*, usually called Mount Ephraim, represented the heart of the N. kingdom. It was the northern part of the high central range, of which Mount Judah was the southern. It extended N. to the plain of Megiddo; its S. border was not closely defined. Later Mount Ephraim became the province of Samaria, and so the writer or the glossator added *the fields of Samaria*. *Gilead* must stand here for the whole east Jordan country. That *Benjamin* should be singled out as taking Gilead and that he should be in the transjordanic country where he did not live before the exile is strange. The reading *Benjamin* is a corruption of *B^{e}nê ʿAmmôn*. The Ammonites had come westward after the fall of Samaria and had occupied the territory of Gad, extending north to the river Jabbok (Je. $49^{1.\,2}$). The country of the Ammonites, therefore, which lay between the Arnon and the Jabbok,—so the writer explains,—was *Gilead*. The text of v. ^{19} reads thus, *and they shall possess the Negeb, i. e., Mount Esau, and the Shephelah, i. e., the Philistines, and they shall possess Mount Ephraim, i. e., the fields of Samaria, and the Ammonites, i. e., Gilead*.—**20.** The text is very uncertain. The general tenor appears to be that the exiles of northern Israel shall reconquer the northern and the exiles of Judah the southern part of the ancient dominion. The northern limit is *Ṣar^{e}phath* or *Sarepta* (Lk. 4^{24}), the Phœnician town on the coast of the Mediterranean between Tyre and Sidon (1 K. $17^{9\,\mathrm{ff.}}$), the modern *Ṣarafend* and the *Ṣariptu* of the Assyrians and Babylonians. The first three words are generally translated either *and the exiles of this fortress* or *of this army*. But nothing in the context explains which army or fortress can be meant. It has sometimes been suggested that *this* indicates the company of exiles to which Ob. himself belonged. But this is not likely. Then it goes on *of Israelites who (?) Canaanites to Ṣarᵉphath*. Evidently the relative clause is corrupt and the best suggestion reads for the rel. part. a vb. which in the Heb. is graphically very similar, *they shall possess*. This corresponds to the second part of the verse. And since the second half defines the exiles of Jerusalem as living in Sᵉpharad, it would seem that the name of a place was also mentioned with the Israelitish exiles; and it is most natural and for graphic reasons easiest to think of *Ḫalaḫ*, one of the places in Assyria whither Israel had been carried (2 K. 17[6] 18[11] 1 Ch. 5[26]), the *Ḫalaḫu* in Mesopotamia. The text would then read, *The exiles of the Israelites who are in Ḫalaḫ shall possess Phœnicia as far as Ṣarᵉphath, and the exiles of Jerusalem who are in Sᵉpharad shall possess the cities of the Negeb*. By the *Canaanites* the Phœnicians are meant. The author was one of those who believed in the return of the northern tribes, a belief which was shared, *e. g.*, by Jeremiah and Ezekiel, but which later on became a matter of dispute among the rabbis. *Cf.* Schürer,[3] ii, 538. That there was still in his time a well-defined body of Israelitish exiles at Ḥalaḥ is unnecessary to assume. The writer knew from the study of sacred literature that Ḥalaḥ was one of the places whither the Israelites had been carried. *Sᵉpharad*, where the Judean captivity lived, was most likely either a region in Asia Minor in the vicinity of Bithynia and Galatia or a name for Asia Minor as a whole (*v. i.*). The Bab. exiles had long since returned. At the time of the writer the province of Judea was occupied by the Jews. Its reoccupation is not mentioned because it was an accomplished fact.—**21.** *And they shall go up as saviours to Mt. Zion to punish Mt. Esau*. It is, of course, the exiles of v. [20] who will march to Jerusalem to help their brethren in the overthrow of Edom, which the Jerusalemites alone could evidently not accomplish, an indication of their lack of military strength at the time of this writer. We., *et al.*, have thought of the Maccabees who came up from the country to help Jerusalem and who defeated Edom. It has seemed strange to some, from the time of 𝔊 on to our own day, that they should go up to Mt. Zion, when they intended to punish *Mt.* Esau which was not on Mt. Zion. And so they have preferred to read *they shall go up from Mt. Zion.* But the usual combination of going *up* instead of *down* from Mt. Zion, even if the vb. is taken in the sense of making a military expedition renders the emendation improbable. And was it not, after all, natural for those armies to march to Jerusalem and join forces with the men of Jerusalem for a united attack upon Edom? This renders Marti's proposal to omit either *to Mt. Zion* or preferably *to judge Mt. Esau* unnecessary. The Vrss. read the *saved* for *saviours;* and the translation would be either *and those who are saved shall go up to Mt. Zion* or, *those who are saved in Mt. Zion shall go up.* But this reading which is connected with v. [17a] is not so good as the other.—Then, after the judgment of nations in general and of Edom in particular, the golden time of Yahweh's kingdom will come, when He alone shall reign. This is the bright side of the day of Yahweh, the consummation of human history, in glad anticipation of which the psalmists raised the jubilant shout Yahweh reigneth!

DETAILED COMPARISON OF OB. WITH JE. 49

At the outset we should observe that Je. 49[7-11] is composed of two different elements (vv. [8. 11] and vv. [7. 9. 10]), as difference both in thought and metre shows. For vv. [8. 11] are addressed to Dedan and have the rhythmic form 4 : 2; while vv. [7. 9. 10] are addressed to Edom and have the rhythm (3 : 3) + (3 : 2). To these latter Ob. is parall. Gie. and Cor. maintain that there must be a Jeremian nucleus and they regard vv. [7. 8. 10. 11] as such. For our purpose we may disregard vv. [13] (Gie.) [22] (Cor.) about which they are not sure. But v. [10a] belongs with v. [9] which is incomplete without it. And v. [7] should, on their own reasoning, not be regarded as Jeremian because of its relation to Ob. [8]. Vv. [8. 11] belong together and had orig. nothing to do with v. [9]. In v. [8] the Dedanites are exhorted to flee in order that they may not be involved in the awful catastrophe which will overtake Edom. Let them flee precipitously, without waiting to take their orphans and widows; Yahweh will look after them (v. [11]). Dedan, not Edom, is addressed in v. [11], the change from the pl. to the sg. is editorial.

It is striking that in the passages where Je. 49 is parall. to Ob. the metre is quite regular, while in the rest of the prophecy it is not The prevailing rhythm is a double trimeter followed by a pentameter. *Thus saith Yahweh of Hosts* in v. ^{7} belongs to the oracle. Its use in Ez. 2^{4} 3^{27} as an equivalent of *prophecy* shows that it may form a part of an oracle. *And he cannot hide himself* in v. ^{10} is an edit. link between vv. $^{9.\ 10a}$ and v. ^{10b}. It interprets v. ^{10a} as referring to the detection of fugitives, while v. ^{9} shows that the plundering of the treasures was in the mind of the author of the orig. oracle. Ob. expresses this distinctly. The metre is *vs.* the originality of the phrase. Moreover, the metre is so regular throughout that v. ^{15} must also have had the double trimeter form and have read *for behold I have made thee small, greatly despised among the nations.* A copyist disregarded the metre and, solely intent on the parall., put *among the nations* into the first half of the verse and changed מאד *greatly*, which is still preserved in Ob., to בארם *among men. Oracle of Yahweh* in v. ^{16} stands outside of the metre. It is omitted by 𝔊.

In Ob. the metre is not so regular, indeed several times it seems to be disregarded. But also here the rhythm indicates that the orig. oracle must have been metrical. This being so, the presumption is that its metr. form is on the whole more correctly preserved in Je. If the metr. form of Je. 49 were due to an editor, it would be singular that he did not cast the whole oracle in this form.

We may now compare the texts in detail:

V. 1. Ob. *We have heard*, Je. *I have heard.* Since the phrase *from Yahweh* has its full force only if a proph. audition is intended, the sg. must be orig. The pl. in Ob. may be due to text. corruption since 𝔊 has the sg. here also.—The words of the messenger are metr. better in Je. The meaning is the same in both.—Though Je.'s *being sent* (prtc. pass. Qal) and Ob.'s *was sent* (pf. Pu.) presuppose no difference in the cons. text, Je.'s pointing is exegetically preferable, *v. i.* **V. 2.** Je.'s *for* which connects vv. $^{1.\ 2}$ was added by one who overlooked that the sentence *and a messenger . . . battle* is a parenthesis. The connective is wanting in 𝔊, where, however, *behold* is also omitted.—Ob. changes the constr. by adding *thou* after *despised;* in Je. *despised* is dependent on *I have made thee*, in Ob. it begins a new clause.—Ob. *exceedingly*, Je. *among men.* The parallel *among the nations* favours Je.'s *among men*, but Ob.'s *exceedingly* was the orig. text which was changed by a scribe who neglected the metre and only observed the parall., *v. s.* **V. 3.** Metr. Je. is in perfect order, while Ob. lacks a hemistich in the first l. Je. has at the beginning an add. word transl. by RV. *as for thy terribleness*, but which orig. read *thy folly*,* and for the verbal sf. in *hath deceived thee* he has an independent pron. It seems more natural that Ob. omitted *thy folly*, which had already been expressed by *the pride of thy heart*, and joined the sf. to the vb. than that Je. should have added the noun and made the other necessary changes in order to produce the strictly metr. line required at this point.—Je. *the rock*, Ob. *rock*.—In the next l. Je. has the regular double trimeter, while Ob. has a pentameter. Je. *that holdest the height of the hill*, Ob. *the height of his habitation*. If this were Ob.'s orig. text it would be easy to show from gram. considerations (*cf.* text. n.) that Je.'s is better, but in Ob. the pointing was orig. different, as the Vrss. show, *that maketh high his habitation*, מֵרִים for מְרום. The decision rests thus simply on the metre which favours Je. **V. 4.** Ob. has an add. pentameter *that saith in his heart, Who shall bring me down to the ground?* It is so expressive that it seems impossible that Je. should have omitted it, if he had quoted from Ob. The same is true of the striking add. *and though among the stars were set*. If the claim were well founded that without this phrase the foll. *thence* in Je. "hangs altogether in the air" (Cor.), we should have a conclusive argument for Ob.'s priority. But *thence* is altogether in place in Je., for it refers to the high cliffs on which Edom dwells. Metr. the add. in Ob. does not fit into the general scheme which here also is preserved in Je. The difference of the condit. part. is unimportant.

---

* The difficulty of תפלצתך appears to be satisfactorily solved by reading with Pet. תִּפְלָתְךָ (*cf.* Je. 23^{13}), following 𝔊, *ἡ παιγνία σου* and 𝔙, *arrogantia tua.* Du.'s ingenious explanation of הפלצתך as a marg. n. on בארם, *through Edom* בְּאֱדֹם, *thine abomination, i. e., idol* (*cf.* מפלצת 1 K. 15^{13} and Obed-Edom for the divine name) destrovs the metr. symmetry. It helps, however, to explain the origin of the corruption of תפלתך to תפלצתך.

Vv. 5, 6 correspond to Je. $49^{9.10a}$; they precede, therefore, in Je. the verses corresponding to Ob. $^{1-4}$. This diff. of order appears to have no important bearing on the question of originality. **V. 5.** In Ob. *how art thou destroyed!* is added. It interrupts the natural flow of the sentence and can hardly have belonged to the orig. oracle. The further add. in Ob. *if robbers by night* is not necessary to the thought and spoils the metr. scheme. It also was not a part of the orig. oracle. The order of the two similes in Je. retains *thieves* and *by night* and is therefore preferable. Besides, the transition from the vintagers to the thieves is better than vice versa. The metre also favours Je.'s order. However, Ob.'s *steal* is more orig. than Je.'s *have destroyed*, which, by the way, must have orig. been in the impf. tense, *cf.* 𝔊. Je.'s reading originated under the influence of Je. 49^{10b}. Again, the rhetorical question in Ob. is not only more lively and forcible than Je.'s simple statement of fact, but is required at least in the first l. by the sense, for we need the thought that vintagers do leave gleanings and that thieves steal only as much as they need, while the disaster of Edom cannot be explained by an ordinary visitation of thieves and plunderers. This must be the meaning both of Je. and of Ob. **V. 6.** Though not strictly like Je. 49^{10}, it is similar enough to show that they are related. The strong exclamation in Ob. is again more lively and forcible than the simple statement in Je. But the constr. in Je. with its explanation of the author of the calamity, setting the *I* of Yahweh over against the imaginary thieves and vintagers,—not they but *I!*—is clearer and more logical than the abrupt exclamation in Ob. whose form reminds one of the exclamation in v. ^{5}. Whether the terms in Je. aside from the constr. are more original than the synonyms in Ob. cannot be determined, unless the orig. be pre-exilic and the Aram. influence seen in בעה (Ob.) be allowed to decide the question in favour of Je. as the earlier reading. **V. 7.** The continuation is diff. from Je. 49^{10b}.* It is evident that Je. 49^{10b} belongs with 49^{10a}. Not only the metre but also the rounding out of the thought require it. Je. 49^{10b} must therefore have been a part of the orig. oracle. Ob. could not make use of it, he goes his own way. He does no longer quote a prophecy, but gives a specific description of the events which have taken place in his own day and in which he perceives the fulfilment of the older prophecy.†

Vv. 8, 9 are so much alike in thought to Je. 49^{7} that some kind of relation must exist betw. them, even though the phraseology is not so strikingly similar. Again Je.'s metre is correct, while Ob.'s is irregular. It certainly looks as if Ob. had quoted this also in his free manner. But We., *et al.*, object, and insist that vv. $^{8.\,9}$ are a later insertion, because they *predict* the catastrophe of Edom as still to come, while the preceding verses have already described it as past or as just taking place. This appears to be a cogent reason for rejecting these verses, not to mention the use of the 3d pers. for the 2d and the difference of metre. If they clash with the rest of the oracle they cannot be orig. But so would the prediction of the fut. in v. ^{3} clash! We have here the same literary relation. For when the connection with Je. 49 is taken into account it is most plausible that Ob. himself should revert here once more to the older oracle from which he had quoted. He sees this oracle fulfilled. Yahweh had blinded Edom's wise men. Usually so wary, they had not seen the traps which had been set for them. It was a divinely wrought folly intended to destroy them all! Why should Ob. himself not have seen the appropriateness of the other part of the oracle from which he was quoting just as well as the alleged interpolator? This favours the retention of *there was no understanding in thee* in Ob. ^{7} as orig., *v. i.*

---

* 𝔊 in Je. 49^{10} relates the two texts more closely by reading διὰ χεῖρα בִּזְרוֹעַ for זַרְעוֹ. But this does not represent the orig. text. It is due partly to the desire to avoid the conflict between this verse and the next. For v. ^{10} speaks of the utter extinction of the offspring, brothers and neighbours of Edom, while v. ^{11} says, that Yahweh will take care of their widows and orphans. Partly it is due to the other proph. hope that the Judeans will be the agents of Edom's destruction. *Cf.* Ob. ^{18}. Du. thinks 𝔊 contains the orig., and so reconstructs *he is destroyed by the arm of his brethren and neighbours, so that he is no more.*—Cor. restores Je. 49^{10} so as to read *For I myself <search out> Edom, Lay bare his secret places. He cannot hide himself, He is destroyed and is no more.* The rest he regards as secondary.

† We., Now., Marti regard v. ^{6} as secondary because it interrupts for them the connection between v. ^{5} and v. ^{7}, because of the use of the 3d instead of the 2d pers., and because it represents the catastrophe as a plundering of Edom and not as an expulsion from their land. Now., Marti, Cor. assume that it was introduced from Je. into Ob., though acc. to them Je. quoted the rest of the oracle from Ob. But v. ^{6} is really so closely woven into the structure of the passage that it cannot be om. as secondary. In reality the impression of secondariness is caused by Ob.'s modification of the orig. oracle which is still preserved in Je.

Our conclusion is that Ob. quoted in vv. $^{1-9}$ *an older oracle, the orig. of which is better preserved in Je.* 49. This conclusion does not carry with it the further conclusion that Je. was the author. It is reasonable to look for a Jeremian nucleus in the oracle *vs.* Edom (Gie., Cor., Bu.), and *a priori* it is not impossible that either vv. $^{8.\ 11}$ or vv. $^{7.\ 9.\ 10}$ might form this nucleus. With the latter vv. $^{14-16}$ are held together by the same metre and by the parall. in Ob. But while it is not impossible that Je. gave such a brief oracle as vv. $^{8.\ 11}$ in connection with his announcement of Nebuchadrezzar's conquest of W. Asia,—the danger will come from the north sweeping on southward to Dedan (*cf.* Ez. 25),—there is nothing in vv. $^{7.\ 9.\ 10.\ 14-16}$ to warrant our ascribing them to Je., except that they now form part of his book. The manner in which the nations who are allied against Edom are spoken of excludes the Babylonians under Nebuchadrezzar. But if the attack on Edom did not fall under the general sweep of Nebuchadrezzar's conquests, was Je. likely to turn aside to threaten Edom? It is true the time came when Je., however much absorbed in the affairs of his own country, must have thought of Edom—after 586 B.C.! But would he then not have referred to Edom's behaviour toward Judah at the time of Jerusalem's fall?

TEXTUAL NOTES.

1. *Thus saith the Lord Yahweh to Edom*, or *concerning Edom*, is regarded as secondary by Eich., *et al.*, because Yahweh does not speak the words which immediately follow, and because it seems superfluous after *the Vision of Obadiah*. Besides, the parall. in Je. 49^{7} has a diff. order, *Concerning Edom: Thus saith Yahweh of Hosts.* But this is due to the editor of the prophecies *vs.* the nations (*cf.* 49^{1}), where *concerning the Ammonites* is also placed at the beginning. If the phrase is om., there is no hint up to v. ^{6} to whom the oracle is addressed, and the pron. in *against him* (v. ^{1}) has no antecedent. Marti retains, therefore, at least *concerning Edom* (cp. Je. 46^{2} 48^{1} 49$^{1.\ 7.\ 23.\ 28}$). Du. connects it with the oracle itself, *of Edom I heard a report.* But the parall. in Je. 49 is against this. Since Ob. quotes here from an earlier oracle, the whole introd. phrase comes most prob. from him.—אדני יהוה 𝕲 *κύριος ὁ θεός* shows the influence of the Jewish mode of reading the divine name. שמענו 𝕲 *ἤκουσα* שמעתי as in Je. 49^{14}.—מאת יהוה shows that the שמועה proceeds from Yahweh as its author. וציר בגוים שלח may be variously construed, as logically the object of שמועה Ges. §$^{120\ f.}$, as an independent clause parall. to שמועה שמענו, or as a circumstantial clause.—שֻׁלָּח 𝕲 שָׁלַח *ἐξαπέστειλε*; Je. 49^{14} שָׁלוּחַ. Since the oracle was given while the messenger was making his tour, it is better to read also in Ob. the prtc. pass., so also 𝔗 שְׁלִיחַ. Siev. regards בַּגּוֹיִם as a later add. צִיר 𝔊 περιοχήν, 𝔖 𝔖^{H} חבושיא 𝔙 *munitio*, but Σ ἀγγελίαν. Jer. notes "quod ipse 'legatus' sit, et ipse 'munitio'" (Rahmer). Vol. thought 𝔊 read מצור, but the vb. ἐξαπέστειλε does not agree with this. More likely περιοχήν was orig. περίοχον, *one who rides around*. *Cf.* the similar Gk. corruption in πυρόφορος v. ^{18}. Cappellus, *et al.*, already explained περιοχήν as "a document given to an ambassador, then the ambassador himself" (Vol.).—עָלֶיהָ is read עָליו both here and in Je. by many, because the masc. is used throughout. This is reasonable, but since the variation occurs also Mal. $1^{3.4}$ (תאמר) with Edom, not absolutely necessary. The land (fem.) may be referred to here, not the people as in the oracle.—קומו נקומה *cf.* לְכוּ וְנֵלְכָה Is. 2^{5}. The cohort. with the imv. adds an element of encouragement to the command, thus making the summons more urgent (Je. 4^{5}).—**2.** הִנֵּה with proph. pf. as הֵן Nu. 17^{27}. Du. takes מאד with v. ^{3}.—**3.** זדון from זוד *to boil, bubble over*, an expressive word for arrogance which scorns all limits (Or.). הִשִּׁיאֶךָ 𝔊 ἐπῆρεν, 𝔖^{H} ܐܫܬܥܠ, 𝔙 *extulit*, all mistaking שׂ for שׁ.—שֹׁכְנִי with the old nominal ending, so called *Yodh compaginis*, frequent with cstr. st., Ges. $^{\S 90\,l}$.—חַגְוֵי, also Ct. 2^{14}, presupposes חֲגָוִים as abs. st., sg. חָגוּ Ges. $^{\S 93\,x}$. 𝔊 ὀπαῖς, *holes, clefts*, Je. 49^{17} τρυμαλιάς, Ct. 2^{14} σκέπῃ, *cf.* ܫܓܐ, *cavern*. BDB. compares Ar. حَجَا *conceal*, حَجًا, حَجْرٌ *place of refuge*, *protection*, and transl. *places of concealment*, *retreats*. Buhl compares حَقْو *the rugged valley side*, and transl. *Felsenklüfte, Schluchten*.—מְרוֹם, if orig., would be an acc., depending on שׁכני, which may be construed with the acc. or with ב. But the juxtaposition of both constrs. is harsh. Ew., *et al.*, read therefore בִּמְרוֹם in accordance with 𝔗 בְּרוּמָא, 𝔖 ܒܡܪܘܡܐ. Hi., *et al.*, regard the force of ב in בחגוי as holding over to מרום which is in apposition to it. Or., Ehr. read מָרוֹם, Gr. מִמְּרוֹם. Siev., JMPS. insert תֹּפְשִׂי from Je. 49. But the Vrss. show that the orig. read מֵרִים, 𝔊 ὑψῶν, 𝔖^{H} ܡܬܪܝܡ, 𝔙 *exaltens*, Pet., Du., Con., Marti, Now.—שִׁבְתּוֹ and בְּלִבּוֹ with sf. 3d sg. for 2d pers. frequently in rel. and prtc. clauses, Mi. 1^{2}, Is. 22^{16} 47^{8} 54^{1} 63^{19}.—**4.** תַּגְבִּיהַּ here abs., *soar aloft*, as in Jb. 39^{27}, 𝔊 μετεωρισθῇς. In Je. 49 it has an object קִנֶּךָ.—שִׂים prtc. pass., Nu. 24^{21}. Ki., Houb., We., *et al.*, read תָּשִׂים, a simple and natural correction, 𝔊 θῇς.

5. אֵיךְ נִדְמֵיתָה 𝔊 ἀπεῤῥίφης = נִרְמֵיתָה. So Wkl. who compares Assyr. *ramû*. It is no serious objection that the Ni. of רמה does not occur in OT. Wkl. places the exclamation after כַּנֶּשֶׁר v. ^{4}. But if orig. it stood rather at the beginning of v. ^{5}. Van H. puts it after v. ^{5}. Du. regards it as orig. in its present place. Jer. read *quomodo conticuisses* נִדְמַתָּה, which was regarded by older commentators as the orig. reading (*cf.* Pet.) We., Now., Marti om. the phrase. Che. om. לילה איך נרמיתה as "an editor's transformation of a corruptly written הֲלֹא יַשְׁחִיתוּ (cp. Jer. 49^9)."—שודדי destroyers, despoilers, here *robbers*, as גנבים shows. אִם condit. part., not interrog., for that would make the constr. artificial. עֹלֵלוֹת 𝔊 *ἐπιφυλλίδας*, in Je. *κατάλιμμα*. דים 𝔊 *τὰ ἱκανὰ αὐτοῖς*, in Je. *χεῖρα αὐτῶν* (ידם). 𝔗 interprets בצרים by חָטוֹפִין כְּקָטוֹפִין *robbers like vintagers.*—**6.** נחפשו 𝔗 אִתְבְּלַשׁ, though עֵשָׂו may be coll., Ges. $^{§ 145. 2}$, the pl. is prob. a scribal error, so also Ehr., Hal. נבעו Aram. ܒܥܐ. *Cf.* Is. 21^{12}. 𝔊 *κατελή(μ)φθη* and *κατελ(ε)ίφθη*, which sounded alike, seems to have read נֶעֶזְבוּ, 𝔐 is correct, *cf.* parallel חפש.—מצפוניו 𝔊 *τὰ κεκρυμμένα*, Wkl. thinks of *mines*, but this was hardly intended by Ob., though there were mines in Edom. He transl. the whole, "How is Edom searched out *as far as Gebal*" [transposing עד הגבול thus emended from v. ^{7} and comparing ψ 83^8 for Gebal], "how are his *mines* sought out, *so that they bring no yield!*" [transposing אין תבונה בו with emended תבואה from v. ^{7}]. He thinks that these are the words of the disappointed thieves. Che. emends אֵיךְ נִשְׁבְּרוּ מַחְשְׁבֹתֶיךָ נִבְעֲרוּ תְבוּנֹתֶיךָ "How are thy purposes broken, thy wise thoughts become foolish!"—**7.** עד הגבול, Gr. עַל for עַד. Wkl., van H. join עד הגבול to v. ^{6} and transl. *How is Edom searched through, his treasures sought out to the very border!* (van H.) *as far as Gebal!* (Wkl.), *i. e.*, the Edomitish territory toward the North, ψ 83^8, later called Gebalene. Then they begin a new sentence with שלחוך, *Thine allies have sent thee away*, given thee over, abandoned thee. But this proposal spoils the *ḳinah* metre, and though Ob. is not over particular with the metre, it is not likely that he should have spoiled this effective *ḳinah* line. For שלחוך Che. reads סִכְּלוּךָ *they have befooled thee.* השיאוך יכלו לך אנשי שלמך = Je. 38^{22}, only Je. has הסיתוך for השיאוך. We., etc., divide the clauses differently from 𝔐, *Unto the border have they sent thee. All the men of thy covenant have deceived thee, the men of thy peace have prevailed over thee.* But Je. 38^{22} as well as the metre favour 𝔐. 𝔊 *ἀντέστησαν*, 𝔖^{H} ܩܡܘ mistook שׂ for שׁ, the same mistake v. ^{3}; 𝔙 here correctly *illuserunt tibi.* לחמך has been variously explained, (1) by taking it with the following *thy bread they make a snare under thee;* (2) by supplying or understanding אַנְשֵׁי or אֹכְלֵי, *cf.* ψ 41^{10} (איש שלומי parall. אכל לחמי), 𝔗 אָכְלֵי פָתוֹרָךְ, many Gk. mss. add *οἱ ἐσθίοντες*, or *οἱ συνεσθίοντές σοι(σε)*; (3) by translating it *thy flesh* = thy blood relations cp. Ar. لُحْمَةٌ, Bö., *Neue Ährenlese*, ii, 201; or reading לחימיך *thine associates* cp. Syr. ܠܚܡ, van H.; (4) by pointing it לֹחֲמֶיךָ *they who war against thee*, Cappellus, Seydel; *they who eat thy bread*, Hal.; (5) by omitting it with 𝔊, Hi., We., *et al.* But then it should not be taken as due to dittog. but as a variant of שלמך (*cf.* ψ 41^{10}); (6) by emending it to לְהַמְּךָ *to scare, discomfit thee*, Du. See further below. The meaning of מָזוֹר is disputed. We., Now. leave the whole clause untranslated.

מָזוֹר has nothing to do with מָזוֹר *wound*, Ho. 5^{13}, though it has frequently been translated thus. Cal., *e. g.*, transl. '*they have fixed under thee a wound*, as when one hides a dagger between the bed and the sheet when a person intends to go to sleep.' Also AV., RV.^{m}. Similarly Hal. transl. *ceux qui mangeaient ton pain t'ont infligé des plaies à l'abdomen*, cp. Hb. 3^{16} for this use of תחתיך. 𝔊 *ἔνεδρα*, 𝔗 תַּקְלָא, 𝔖 ܡܟܡܢܐ, 𝔙 *insidiæ*, Aq. *ἐπίδεσιν*, Θ *δεσμόν*, Σ *ἀλλοτρίωσιν*. All presuppose the same Heb. text. Aq. Θ appear to have connected it with מוֹסֵר. Σ connects it with זור *to be a stranger*. The root מזר should be compared with NH. מזר *to twist*, *weave*, *spin*, and Aram. ܡܙܪ *to bind* from which the meaning *cord*, *rope*, *snare*, is naturally derived. *Cf.* 𝔗 Aq. Θ. BDB. cp. "Aram. ܐܬܡܙܪ *stretch oneself*, *cf.* Ar. مَزَرَ *æqualiter distendit* utrem" and transl. "perh. *net* (as something extended)." *Cf.* 1 Mac. 5^{4} *οἳ ἦσαν τῷ λαῷ εἰς παγίδα καὶ εἰς σκάνδαλον ἐν τῷ ἐνεδρεύειν αὐτοὺς ἐν ταῖς ὁδαῖς.* The various emendations of מזור are unnecessary. Vol. מָצוֹר or מְצוּדָה *net;* Gr. מַכְמֹר or מִכְמֹר *snare;* Prince, *JBL.*, xvi, 1897, p. 177, מָצוֹר *siege*, this would necessitate, however, the further change of תחת into עַל with שִׂים מצור. Wkl. יאכלו לך לחמך ישיאו מצוד תחתיך *they shall eat thy flesh, shall take away from thee thy food.* Marti מָדוֹר *dwelling* (*cf.* Dn. 4$^{22.29}$ 5^{21}); for the phrase שִׂים מָדוֹר *to make one's dwelling, settle down*, he compares שִׂים קֵן v.^{4}. He might also have referred to 𝔗's translation, מְדוֹרָךְ, of קִנֶּךָ v.^{4}. But Heb. idiom usually requires the sf. מְדוֹרָם or דּוֹרָם (*cf.* Is. 38^{12}), Ar. دَارٌ. Marti's emendation might be adopted, for it is most attractive esp. from a hist. point of view, if the usage of מדור did not make it somewhat doubtful. If we retain מזור in the sense of *snare*, we must obviate the difficulty of the unhebraic תחתיך with וישימו מזור. The text most prob. read for תחתיך orig. וַתֵּחַת כִּי; this connects closely with the preceding and the foll. (*cf.* v.^{9}), and the whole clause then reads, with emended לְהָמֵךְ, *to discomfit thee they had kept setting traps and thou wast dismayed* (*destroyed*), *because there was no understanding in thee* (בך). In אין תבונה בו the sf. must refer to Edom, 𝔊 *αὐτοῖς*, but this is strange because of the 2d pers. throughout the verse. Many refer the sf. to מזור and transl. they have placed snares under thee *which thou didst not notice.* But grammatically this is not probable. Others have regarded it as an independent sentence. But the 3d pers. is then not adequately explained. Con. transposes it after נאם יהוה v.^{8}, Now.^{K} after ביום ההוא v.^{8}. But then תבונה, unless emended, occurs twice in too close succession. We., Marti, Du. om. the phrase as a marg. comment of a reader or as a variant of v.^{8}. The best proposal is Gr.'s who emends בו to בָּךְ. Similarly 𝔗 מְדַלִּית בָּךְ סוּכְלְתָנוּ.

8. BDB. suggests that אִישׁ was om. by a scribal error before תְבוּנָה;

why not rather אַנְשֵׁי ? Others change תבונה to מְבִינִים to make it more closely parall. with חכמים. It is easier to change חכמים to חכמה, the ם is due to dittog. *Cf.* Je. 49^7.—**9**. גבוריך, Marti, Now.^{K} גבורי, but this is not necessary. מקטל *by slaughter*, not *without slaughter;* a late word in Heb. Gr.'s interesting conjecture מִיָּקְתְאֵל *from Jokteel, i. e.*, Petra (*cf.* 2 K. 14^7), has found no approval. It is dub. whether the Selah which Amaziah called Jokteel was Petra. Though 𝔊 𝔖 𝔙 join מקטל to v. ^{10}, the metre as well as Jo. 4^{20} favour 𝔐. Now., *et al.*, om. it as a variant of מחמס.

10. *Cf.* Jo. 4^{20}. Siev., JMPS., Du. om. יעקב for metr. reasons. Van H. suggests as orig. מקטל אחיך מחמס יעקב. But this is not likely.—**11**. ביום 𝔊 מִיּוֹם; Du. appears to om. יום, reading מֵעָמְדְךָ, but the constr. favours 𝔐. עמד מנגד to stand *aloof*, BDB. *Cf.* 2 S. 18^{13}. 𝔗 מִקְּבֵל. Buhl transl., *to stand there as an indifferent, hostile spectator;* Wkl., *to stand in the way;* We., Now., Marti, *to be present*, ψ 38^{12}. חילו 𝔗 נִכְסוֹהִי; Du. transl. *his wall* and emends שבות to שְׁבוֹר, which governs both חילו and שערו, for he om. also באו. Du. has correctly seen that 𝔐 is wrong, for the carrying off into captivity should not precede the capture of the city. But it is dub. whether שבר can be used with חיל, *wall.* It seems to me more likely that instead of חילו the orig. had בְּרִיחַ לו, *when they broke for him the gate-bar and entered his gate. Cf.* Am. 1^5. באו should not be om. שערו, Qr. 𝔊 𝔖 𝔙 שְׁעָרָו, but unnecessary, sg. also v. ^{13}. ידו גורל, the vb. ידד occurs only here and Na. 3^{10} Jo. 4^3. BDB. suggests that it may be a wrongly pointed pf. of ידה Pi. in all cases. Gr. proposed יָרוּ, which occurs with גורל (Jos. 18^6). On the Metheg in עֲמָדְךָ, *cf.* Sta., *Grammatik* 52a. Du. inserts before גם־אתה *tatest gross* הִגְדַּלְתָּ, accounting presumably for its omission by haplo., *cf.* the preceding גורל.

12–14. JMPS. regards vv. $^{12-14}$ as secondary, chiefly because they are written in *ḳinah* metre, "while the preceding and following context is in ordinary trimeter." He is also impressed by the abruptness in the transition from the past to the present in these verses. But the abruptness must not be exaggerated. See *ad loc.* Smith's principal argument is ineffective, because the metr. structure is not regular, and besides, the *ḳinah* lines in vv. $^{12-14}$ are by no means the only ones in Ob., *cf.*, *e. g.*, vv. $^{6.\ 7}$. Peckham follows Smith in athetizing vv. $^{12.\ 13.\ 14b}$, but regards v. ^{14a}, without the negative, as the continuation of v. ^{11}.—**Vv. 12, 13** are so similar that We., Now. om. v. ^{12} as secondary, while Wkl. regards them as variants of the same text. Marti combines these two positions, regards v. ^{13} as orig. and corrects v. ^{13b} by v. ^{12a} so as to read *do not gloat over thy brother on the day of his misfortune.* The reason for preferring v. ^{13} is that it connects better with v. ^{11} and that it does not presuppose a preceding imv. which v. ^{12} with its *and* does. Wkl. prefers v. ^{12} omitting the copula. Du. also; he om. v. ^{13bc}. JMPS. om. vv. $^{12b.\ 13b}$ and rearranges the order, $^{13a.\ 12a.\ 12c.\ 13c}$. But though the similarity is close, it is really only v. ^{13b} that can be regarded as a variant of v. ^{12}, for it alone expresses the same thought. And as it stands, it is not in its right place between v. ^{13a} and v. ^{13c}. It would seem to belong with v. ^{12}, as also the גם אתה, which was taken from v. ^{11}, might indicate. Since v. ^{12a} and v. ^{13b} cannot have stood together in the same sentence, v. ^{13b} would seem to be a variant of v. ^{12a}. It appears, however, more likely to me that הרא in v. ^{13} was orig. הָרַע, and that ברעהו was an abbreviated ביום רעתו. The abbreviation was overlooked and a scribe put ביום ארו after it. Orig. v. ^{13b} therefore read *Do not thou also* (*sc.* as the barbarians) *behave wickedly in the day of his distress.* But v. ^{12a} is not quite in order either. Now., Marti, *et al.*, read באחיך for ביום אחיך in the interest of a smoother text, but it is preferable to retain ביום אחיך and to emend ביום נכרו to כְּמוֹ נָכְרִי *like a barbarian*, *cf.* 𝔊. Or, with Ehr., כְּיוֹם נָכְרִי *as if it were the day of a stranger*. This connects better with the preceding, makes it easier to account for the present text and disposes of נכרו which in spite of Jb. 31^{3} is not certainly = *misfortune*. Wkl., JMPS. read נכרהו, but that is grammatically impossible.—**13**. Now., Marti read אֵידוֹ for אֵידָם in v. ^{12a}, and in v. ^{12c} אָבְדוֹ for אֵידוֹ to avoid the repetition of איד. 𝔊 apparently supports this, for it transl. the words by three synonyms and uses ἀπωλεία in v. ^{12b} for אבדם, and so presumably here also.—ברעהו 𝔊 τὴν συναγωγὴν αὐτῶν = בַּעֲדָתוֹ (!). The pl. in תשלחנה is impossible, it may be = תִּשְׁלַחְ־נָא, Ges. § 47 k. *Cf.* Ju. 19^{23} for attaching נָא to the vb. instead of to אַל, and 2 S. 6^{6} 22^{17} (parall. ψ 18^{17}) for the omission of יָד with שלח. Or we may read with Ols., Ew., *et al.*, תִּשְׁלַח יָד, or, better, יָדֶיךָ. Gr. reads יָדְךָ for ביום ארו, but this disturbs the rhythmic balance which was evidently intended.—**14**. פֶּרֶק only here and Na. 3^{2}. In Na. 3^{2} it means *plunder*, parall. טֶרֶף, but it cannot mean this here. The root פרק seems to mean *to tear apart*, *to rend*. *Cf.* Ar. فرق *to split*, *divide*. There is difference of opinion whether it refers to a breach in the wall or to the parting of the ways. 𝔊 διεκβολάς, 𝔙 *exitibus* favour the former, 𝔗 (פרקא) the latter. Σ φυγαδείας is non-committal. The Ar. مَفْرِقٌ *bifurcation* (van H.) and the observation that פליטיו most prob. refers to persons who have already escaped from the city favour the transl. *parting of the ways;* so BDB., Marti, van H.—תַּסְגֵּר is used here abs. in the sense of delivering up, betraying, Dt. 32^{30}, Am. 6^{8}.

16. The reading 𝔊 𝔖^{H} שָׁתִיתָ for שתיתם is an exegetical emendation. Perhaps we should read שָׁתָה עַמִּי, if it were necessary. Du. שָׁתוּ הֵם. Some, in order to minimise the abruptness in the change of address, transl., somewhat artificially, *as ye*, *who are*, or *live*, *upon my holy mountain* (*i. e.*, the Judeans) *have drunk.* For תָּמִיד many Heb. mss. read

סָבִיב, which has been favoured by some ever since de R. 𝔊^NcaAQY have *οἶνον*, 𝔖^H ܡܣܟܪܐ. Rosenm. emended, therefore, תמיר to חֶמֶר (*cf.* Dt. 32^14), and this is still adopted by many, though the NH. חֲמַר, *wine*, is preferred by some. But *they shall drink wine*, without any qualification of the character of the wine, can only mean that they shall carouse and revel. It is altogether unwarranted to interpret it as referring to the cup of wrath. We should either transl. תמיד, with Ehr., *without exception*, or emend it. In the latter case we may read either חֲמָתִי, *my fury* (*cf.* Jb. 6^4), Gr.: חֵמָה, or we may assume that the reading *οἶνον* was a transl. of סֹבֶא as in Is. 1^22 and that both תמיד and סבא belonged orig. to the text יִשְׁתּוּ כָל־הַגּוֹיִם אֵת הַכּוֹס מִיָּדִי, *all the nations shall drink the cup at my hand*. See Bewer, in *Harper Memorial Volumes*, ii, 207–10.—The meaning of לעע or לוע is not quite certain. It is transl. either *swallow, swallow down*, *cf.* לֹעַ *throat*, NH., Aram.: *jaw, cheek*, BDB.; or *talk wildly*, *cf.* Ar. لَغَا, لَغِيَ, *make mistakes in talking*, Hi., Del.; van H. compares Syr. ܠܚܟ (ܠܘܚܟ), and transl. *lick*. The readings *καταπίονται* (*καταπίωνται*) by a number of Gk. mss., *καταποθήσονται* by Compl., and *absorbebunt* by 𝔙 favour *swallow down*. The most important Gk. mss. read *ἀναβήσονται* or *καταβήσονται*. *Ἀναβήσονται* witnesses to ולעו, for it read ועלו for ולעו. Gressmann, *Der Ursprung d. isr. jüd. Eschatologie*, 132, reads ויעלו, but transl. *and shall drink again*, comparing Ar. عَلّ. That *καταβήσονται* does not presuppose an original וירדו (van H.) is obvious. It is much rather a corruption of *καταποθήσονται*, or as Vol. thought a correction of *ἀναβήσονται*. Usually, however, בלע is translated by *καταπίνω*, Ho. 8^8, Jon. 2^1, Hb. 1^13, and in view of this Gr.'s emendation נִבְלְעוּ (*cf.* Is. 28^7) has force esp. also in connection with והיו כלוא היו. Pu. בֻּלְּעוּ, is, however, preferable. We., *et al.*, read ונעו *and they shall reel, totter*, *cf.* Is. 24^20 29^9, ψ 107^27. This gives excellent sense, but וּבֻלְּעוּ seems to me better. Wkl. needlessly reads for the three forms of שׁתה, three forms of שׁאה, *destroy*, and interprets ולעו by this, *and shall be destroyed and devastated*. Siev. om. ולעו, JMPS. ושתו for metr. reasons.—כְּלוֹא = כַּאֲשֶׁר לֹא, note the plene writing of לוא, also in v. ^8.—**17**. The subj. in והיה קדש is הר ציון. *Cf.* Jo. 4^17. Marti (*Com.*), Now., *et al.*, regard the phrase as secondary. But Marti in his transl. of 1909 leaves it in the text. Siev. supplies ירושלם from Jo. 4^17. מוֹרָשֵׁיהֶם is pointed by the Vrss. מוֹרִישֵׁיהֶם. JMPS. om. בית יעקב for metr. reasons.—**18**. שָׂרִיד is transl. idiomatically *πυρφόρος* by 𝔊^A (*πυροφορος* is corrupt) 𝔏 *ignifer*. 𝔖^H ܫܩܠ ܢܘܪ. It has reference to the custom of the priest's marching before the army with a torch kindled at the sacred altar fire. His person was regarded as inviolable. Therefore the proverbial expression for absolute destruction was *οὐδὲ πυρφόρος ἐλείφθη*. Vol. quotes Hesychius, *πυρφ. ὁ πῦρ φέρων καὶ ὁ μόνος διασωθεὶς ἐν πολεμῷ*.

19. 𝔊 𝔖^{H} 𝔙 take הנגב and השפלה as subj. But v. ^{17b} shows that the subj. of וירשו is בית יעקב. The very constr., הנגב and השפלה acc. without את but את הר עשו and את פלשתים with את, indicates that the latter are explanatory. *Cf.* the same constr. in Ez. 4^{1} עיר את ירושלם, also Ez. 36^{12}. The transl. of את by *together with* is improbable. Similarly את שדה שמרון is explanatory of אפרים, and בְּנֵי־עַמּוֹן of הגלעד. Orig. the text read בני עמון which was corrupted to בנימן. So now also Du. Gr. suggests מהירדן for בנימן, van H. ועבר הירדן *and the transjordanic region, i. e., Gilead.* But it is difficult to see how either of these could be corrupted to בנימן. The explanatory words are by the writer himself (*cf.* Ez. 4^{1}) rather than by a glossator, as We., *et al.*, think. שדה אפרים occurs only here, 𝔊 has the usual הר אפרים *τὸ ὄρος.* Or., following Ew., emends to וההר את אפרים *and* (*those of*) *the mountain* [*i. e.*, the inhabitants of the hill country of Judah, in distinction from those of the Negeb and the Shephelah] *shall possess Ephraim and the field of Samaria.* So also GASm. Briggs, *Mess. Proph.*, 316 *f.*, *et al.*, om. את שדה before אפרים and transl. *and Ephraim will possess the field of Samaria and Benjamin, Gilead.* Van H. combining this with We.'s observation, transl. *and they shall possess Ephraim, i. e., the field of Samaria.* Acc. to Hal. the subj. of וירשו את שדה אפ׳ is Joseph, which holds over from v. ^{18}. But a whole sentence intervenes in which two other parties are the subj. also acc. to Hal. הר עשו occurs only in Ob. $^{8.\ 9.\ 19.\ 21}$.—**20.** החל הזה 𝔊 *ἡ ἀρχὴ αὐτοῦ*, connects חל with חלל. Aq. *εὐπορίας αὐτῶν*, Σ Θ *τῆς δυνάμεως ταύτης*, 𝔖 ܒܡܫܡܫܢܐ ܕܡܢܗܢܐ, 𝔙 *exercitus huius.* Usually החל has been transl. *army* or *fortress.* Ew.'s reading *coast* (from חול *sand*) has not been followed by any one. Wkl. thinks that a vb., perhaps עלה, was orig. contained in it. Che., *EB.*, suggests יְחַלּוּ, without, however, adopting it himself.—אשר כנענים: The readings of some Heb. mss. אשר בכ׳, 𝔗 דבארעה, 𝔖 ܘܦܠܚ ܦܠܚܐ, 𝔙 *omnia loca Chananæorum* are interpretations. אשר is emended by most to יָרְשׁוּ or אֶרֶץ or both.* Adopting יָרְשׁוּ and combining an earlier suggestion of Che.† with van H.'s ‡ we may restore וְגֹלַת בַּחֲלַח [זֶה לִבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל] יָרְשׁוּ the bracketed phrase would be a gloss. Or still better we may follow more closely the order of v. ^{b} and read with a necessary transposition וְגָלֻת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר בַּחֲלַח יִרְשׁוּ.§

---

* If only אֶרֶץ is read, וירשו of v. ^{19a} must hold over. Briggs, *l. c.*, 316 *f.*, without changing 𝔐 transl., *and the captivity of this host of the children of Israel* (*will possess*) *that which belongeth to the Canaanites.* But the Heb. of this would be אשר לכנענים, Stei. emends thus, but even then the reading is awkward. Keil transl. *and the captives of this army of the sons of Israel* (*will take possession*) *of what Canaanites there are.*

† Che., *Exp.*, xxxv, 1897, p. 367, suggested that החל הזה was perhaps a fragment of בחלח ובחבור נהר גוזן *and the exiles of the Israelites who are in Halah and by Habor, the river of Gozan, will conquer Phœnicia as far as Zarephath.* Similarly now also Du., *the exiles of Chalach and Chabor will take the land of the Phœnicians.* He regards בני ישראל as a better variant of ירושלם v. ^{20b}.

‡ Van H. reads וגלת הַהֹלָה זה לבני ישראל (prtc. of חול), assumes a lacuna after אשר which he fills out in part and transl. the whole *et les captifs 'qui sont dans l'attente,' ceux des enfants d'Israel qui* [*sont à . . .*, *occuperont le pays des*] *Cananéens jusqu' à Sarpath.*

ספרד, 𝔊 ἕως Ἐφραθα, Σ Σαφαρά, 𝔊$^{\text{Ald.}}$ Ἀφαράθ. 𝔊's reading originated prob. from εν σεφαραδ. So Rahmer, who also mentions a marg. n. of Jer. on *Σαρεπτῶν in exemplario Eusebiano* Ἐφραθά *erat*, acc. to which ἕως Ἐφραθά would not be a transl. of בספרד but another, marg. transl. of עַד צרפת, which came into the text at the wrong place. Jer.'s translation *in Bosphoro* was due to his mistaking the prep. for a part of the word. 𝔗 אספמיא, 𝔖 ܐܶܣܦܰܢܝܳܐ, *Spain;* this became the prevailing Jewish interpretation, Ra., AE., Ki., Abar. The Spaniards are the ספרדים.—Schrader, *KAT.*^{2}, 445 *ff.* (*COT.*, ii, 145), also in Ri., *HWB.*, *s. v.*, identified Sepharad with *Šaparda* of the inscriptions of Sargon, in SW. Media toward Babylonia. So also Dl., Lenormant, GASm. But Bart. rightly observes, "If there was a Jewish colony of captives here, however, nothing is otherwise known of it; nor are any circumstances evident which would render probable the existence at this point of a colony of sufficient importance to be referrred to in the terms used by Obadiah." De Sacy identified it with *Çparda* of the Persian cuneiform inscriptions, a region in Asia Minor in the neighbourhood of Bithynia and Galatia. So also, *e. g.*, Ges., Hi., Kue., WRS., Say., Bart. WRS. and Say. observed that it is "again mentioned in an inscription of the 32d year of Kings Antiochus and Seleucus, *i. e.*, 275 B.C." Since the Persian period it was used as a name for Asia Minor as a whole (Wkl., *AOF.*, ii, 430; *KAT.*^{3}, 301). See also Che., *EB.*, Marti. Jo. 3^{16} shows that Jews were sold to Gk. traders, and WRS. reminds us that "Lydia was a great slave-market, and Asia Minor was a chief seat of the Diaspora at an early date." There is a tradition of a Jewish captivity in Asia Minor under Artaxerxes Ochus (Eus., *Chron.*, ed. Schoene, ii, 112, 113; Solinus, 35, 4; Orosius, iii, 7, 6 *f.*), but some doubt its historicity. Again, acc. to Jos., *Ant.*, xii, 3, 4, a colony of 2,000 Jewish families was transported from Mesopotamia to Lydia and Phrygia by Antiochus the Great (224–187 B.C.). The historicity of this is denied by Willrich, *Juden und Griechen*, 39 *ff.*, suspected by Guthe, *EB.*, but accepted by Schürer. Wkl. believes that the Jewish captives of Antiochus Epiphanes (168 B.C.) are referred to. Bö., Gr. emended אַרְוָד or אַרְפָּד, *cf.* Ald. Ἀφαράθ. Van H. has revived Schrader's older view that סְפַרְוַיִם (2 K. 17^{24} 18^{34}) was meant. He reads ספרו (ספרה), the sg. form of ספרוים, = *Sipar.* Similarly Hal. בִּסִפָּרָה *in Sippara* or *Sippar*, near Tel Abib where Ez. lived.—**21**. מוֹשִׁעִים, act., so 𝔗 משזבין, Σ *σώσονες*, 𝔙 *salvatores*. But 𝔊 Aq. Θ 𝔖 pass., either מוּשָׁעִים or נוֹשָׁעִים, so also Gr., Now., Hal.—בהר ציון, 𝔊 𝔖^H, Hi., Gr., Du.: מֵהַר, but עלה is not used with מן in connection with Mt. Zion. Hal. takes נושעים בהר ציון = נושעים אשר בהר'. "Des (guerriers), sauvés au Mont Sion, partiront Pour exercer le jugement sur le montagne d'Ésaü." This is the best interpretation, if the pass. is adopted. עלה, *to make an expedition* (*cf.* Ho. 8^9 Je. 49^{28} 50^9). עלה with ב, *cf.* Ju. 1^3, 2 S. 2^1, ψ 24^3, 1 Ch. 14^{11}. לשפט 𝔊 correctly ἐκδικῆσαι. Ke., Perowne, van H. think of government. But such a use of שפט for Judah's rule over other nations is quite improbable. Marti om. either בהר ציון or preferably לשפט את הר עשו as a gloss. Che. reads ליהודה for ליהוה. Acc. to Zim., *KAT.*^{3}, 647, שפט is an old Bab. loan word.

---

§ Hal. suggests וגלת הַתֵּל הַזֶּה *and the captivity of this tel, i. e.*, תֵּל אָבִיב where Ez. lived, the pron. *this* being chosen because Ob. himself lived there. For אשר he reads יוֹשְׁבוּ *they shall occupy*, or *people*, *cf.* Ez. 36^{33}. He compares Ez. 4^{15} where וְאֵשֵׁב (Qr.) is corrupted to ואשר (Kt.).—A trace of the Isr. exiles in Ḥalaḥ has been found in an inscription, ADD., II, No. 755 (K. 123), published and commented on by S. Schiffer, *Keilinschriftliche Spuren der in der zweiten Hälfte des 8. Jahrh. von den Assyrern nach Mesopotamien deportierten Samarier* (10 *Stämme*). The passage reads, *A-ḫi-ia-ḳa-a-mu ina* (*mât*) *Ḫa-laḫ-ḫi e-rib*, Ahi-iaḳâmu (Bib. אֲחִיקָם Aḥiḳam) has come to Ḥalaḥ (p. 29). There is no doubt that he was a Hebrew. II R 53 *Ḫa-laḫ-ḫu* is mentioned with *Ra-ṣa-ap-pa*, Biblical *Reṣeph*, modern Rusâfe between Palmyra and the Euphrates. K. 10922 it is mentioned with Ḥarrân (Schiffer), Wkl. places it, therefore, near Ḥarrân, *KAT.*^{3}, 269.

COMMENTARY ON JOEL.

INTRODUCTION TO JOEL.

§ 1. THE COMPOSITION OF THE BOOK.

The book of Joel has usually been regarded as the work of one author and is still treated as such by all recent commentators. And this in spite of the fact that M. Vernes as early as 1872 maintained that chs. 3, 4 were not written by the author of chs. 1, 2.* He restated his position in 1874 and in a less dogmatic form in 1880, when he did not *insist* on difference of authorship, though he still maintained the difference and irreconcilability of the two sections. Vernes' thesis remained unnoticed until, independently of him, J. W. Rothstein in 1896 argued for difference of authorship for chs. 1, 2 and chs. 3, 4. Then Nowack called attention to Vernes and interpreted in his counter-arguments Vernes' non-insistence on duality of authorship as a practical abandonment of his position. G. A. Smith and Marti followed Nowack's lead in opposing Rothstein's position, G. A. Smith not without reserve. But more recently Ryssel, Sievers, Duhm and P. Haupt have agreed that the book is no unity. Ryssel adopted Rothstein's literary position, regarding chs. 1, 2 from one author, chs. 3, 4 from another. Sievers considers $2^{12-14.\ 19-27}$ 3^{1-5} $4^{1-8.\ 17-21}$, Duhm 2^{18}–4^{21} as later and both point out insertions in chs. 1, 2.

It is clear that there is a decided difference of interest and subject-matter in both sections. Chs. 1, 2 treat of a locust plague and a drought as disciplinary punishment of the Jews; chs. 3, 4 treat of the final judgment of the nations and of the protection and glory of the Jews, without mentioning the locust plague. But though the day of Yahweh dominates chs. 3, 4 the locust plague in chs. 1, 2 is also brought into connection with it in a number of passages. And it is due to this fact, more than to any other, that the unity of authorship has been maintained so strongly even by critics like Nowack and Marti. *But these references to the day of Yahweh in chs.* 1, 2 *turn out to be interpolations.*

---

* The Hebrew text has four chapters, the English Version only three, English 2^{28-32} = Hebrew 3^{1-5}; ch. 3 Engl. = ch. 4 Heb.

1^{15}. Nothing whatever in the context indicates that the prophet had in mind the day of Yahweh, on the contrary vv. $^{2.\,3}$ exclude it. So does the fact that we have here a quotation from Is. 13^{6}, when all through the address we have the words of an original poet and writer. 1^{15} is a foreign element in the context. So also Siev., Du.

$2^{1b.\,2}$. Again the phrases are taken almost *verbatim* from other prophets, Zp. 1^{15} $1^{7.\,14}$ Mal. $3^{2.\,23}$. Moreover, the day of Yahweh and the day of the locusts are connected here in such a manner that it is not clear whether they are the same, or whether the locusts are merely the precursors of the day of Yahweh. The alarm is to be sounded, we are told, first because of the approach of the day of Yahweh and then, all of a sudden, because a huge locust swarm is coming. Then the description of the locust swarm is continued until we come to vv. $^{10.\,11}$ where we again meet most unexpectedly a description of an eschatological army. Duhm also believes that $2^{1b.\,2}$ is an interpolation.

$2^{10.\,11}$. While the locusts in $2^{1\,\text{ff.}}$ might perhaps be interpreted as precursors of the day of Yahweh this is not possible in $2^{10.\,11}$. "In ch. ii. 10," says Davidson, "the plague and the day of the Lord seem brought immediately together . . . this darkening of the sun and moon is not to be rationalised into the effects upon daylight produced by swarms of locusts in the sky, it is a sign of the near approach of the day of the Lord, though not identical with that day (ii. 31, Engl.) . . . these hosts of locusts were the army of the Lord . . . (ii. 25) and He was at the head of the army giving it command; and thus there was virtually that presence and manifestation of the Lord, at least in its beginnings, in which the day of the Lord was verified" (pp. 202 *f.*). These verses do not describe an actual locust flight, as the preceding had done, but the day of Yahweh; and the locusts are the agents of His judgment. And yet in spite of this much more terrible danger of the day of Yahweh the appeal to repentance in vv. $^{12\text{-}14}$ contains as little reference to it as do the prayer of the priests and Yahweh's answer in $2^{18\,\text{ff.}}$. It is the locust plague and the drought that constitute the whole of these passages, the day of Yahweh is not mentioned at all. Rothstein already attributed $2^{10.\,11}$ to the editor who combined chs. 1, 2 with chs. 3, 4. Siev. and Du. retain them, strangely enough.

2^{6}. There are two further traces of this interpolator of the day of Yahweh who tried to connect chs. 1, 2 with chs. 3, 4. The first of these is in 2^{6}. This verse, though not absolutely incompatible with the context, interrupts the description of the advance of the locust swarm. It has more than once been pointed out that עמים, *nations* or *peoples*, is rather peculiar in this connection. Hi.'s transl. *Leute, people*, and his reference to 1 K. 22^{28} in justification of this do not hold good, because שמעו עמים, *hear ye peoples*, in 1 K. 22^{28} is a gloss by a reader who wrote the beginning of the book of the prophet Micah, with whom he identified Micaiah, in the margin.

Why should the nations be introduced at this point, when Joel concentrates his attention upon his own people? It is significant that this verse shows contact with Is. 13 (v. ^{8}), *i. e.* with the same chapter from which the interpolator of the day of Yahweh had drawn his material in 1^{15} (= Is. 13^{6}), 2^{10} also is similar to Is. $13^{10.\ 13}$. The inference is therefore natural that 2^{6} belongs also to the day of Yahweh interpolations. —On 2^{17} see com.

2^{20}. Another trace is in the name *my northerner* in 2^{20}. This is such an unusual and improbable term for a real locust swarm that we must interpret it as an eschatological term for the enemy from the north that had so long been prophesied. The whole context here again shows that Joel had in mind a real locust swarm, for he describes its destruction in terms which are not applicable to human forces. The expression is therefore due to the interpolator of the day of Yahweh. Rothstein attributed 2^{20} as a whole to the editor, W. R. Smith also regarded 2^{20} as a gloss.

After the removal of these interpolations the difference of interest and subject-matter between chs. 1, 2 and chs. 3, 4 becomes even clearer. Chs. 1, 2 treat of a locust plague and drought, and contained originally no reference to the day of Yahweh. Chs. 3, 4 treat of the day of Yahweh, and contain no reference to the locust plague and the drought. The series of interpolations has been deliberately inserted in order to connect chs. 1, 2 with chs. 3, 4. Originally they were distinct and not connected.

But does this conclusion necessarily involve difference of authorship for the two sections? May not Joel be the author of both, different though they are? Surely, the same writer may write on two different subjects at different times! Yet even if we assume this, we cannot hold him responsible for the day of Yahweh interpolations in chs. 1, 2. For it is most improbable that a man of such fine literary style, who knows so well how to express his thoughts in a manner all his own, should in every instance have inserted common, well-known phrases from other prophets into poems of such high literary beauty and finish. For it should be noticed that the literary parallels in chs. 1, 2, which have been pointed out so frequently, are all found in these interpolations. The genuine Joel is original in his expressions.

This is our difficulty with chs. 3, 4 also. As a whole they cannot be said to be stylistically on a level with chs. 1, 2. Their style is so inferior that it argues against unity of authorship. From this must, however, be excepted 4^{9-14}, which are equal in strength and originality of expression as well as rhythmic beauty and effectiveness to chs. 1, 2. Indeed, as soon as it is admitted that a single author may write on two such diverse themes as the locust plague with its accompanying drought and the judgment of the nations in the valley of Jehoshaphat there is every reason for believing that Joel wrote 4^{9-14a}. That striking description of the march and attack of the locust army in ch. 2 has its counterpart in this description of the summoning of the nations to war. The same style and rhythm, the staccato movement, are used in both passages with equal effectiveness. There is thus no cogent reason for denying the authorship of 4^{9-14a} to Joel.

In regard to the remainder of the chapter the matter is different. The author of 4^{9-14a} has such an original manner in describing the preparations for the final attack of heathendom on Jerusalem that it is most improbable that he should have fallen back upon common prophetic phraseology for the description of the battle itself in vv. $^{15.\ 16}$. Indeed, even his dependence on Ezekiel for the general idea, for which see below, makes the originality in which he expresses this idea all the more impressive. From a writer of such force we should have expected a very vivid and striking portrayal of Yahweh's judgment of the nations and we can hardly believe that he should have quoted *verbatim* from other prophets and have produced a passage so general and so lacking in definiteness that commentators have not been certain whether it was a description of the battle or not. Now it is to be noticed that these sentences correspond almost literally to the insertions of the interpolator of the day of Yahweh in $2^{10.\ 11}$ and we may therefore reasonably conclude that this interpolator who depended so much on other prophets for his thoughts and phrases worked over the second part of Joel also. And with this clue we may undertake to determine the extent of his work.

4^{14b}, if correctly preserved, shows characteristic traces of the interpolator's language, *cf.* 1^{15} 2^{1}. And 3^{4b} bears his stamp also, *cf.* 2^{11} and Mal. 3^{23} from which 3^{4b} is taken, just as he had taken the phrase in 2^{11} from Mal. 3^{2}.

4^{17} is also by the editor, for the first half of the verse is composed of phrases which are *characteristic* of Ezekiel and the Holiness Code *and ye shall know that I am Yahweh your God.* And in the second half Ob. ^{17} is quoted and an interpretation is added which is correct enough as an interpretation of Obadiah's phrase but out of accord here with the situation of the preceding. The author of 4^{9-14a}, even if he had written vv. $^{15.16}$, could not have continued as 4^{17} does, *and barbarians shall not pass through her* AGAIN; he would have insisted that at that time, when all the heathen stood before Jerusalem, the Holy City would be safe because of Yahweh's presence. Our editor, however, had the capture of 586 B.C. in mind, *cf.* vv. $^{2.3}$, and explained the phrase of Obadiah accordingly. The sudden change of address in v. ^{17} also would be strange in Joel, but is in line with 2^{27} which is very similar to 4^{17}. It exhibits the editor's quoting style and is therefore by him.

In 4^{18-21} we have evidences of the editor's hand in v. $^{18a\alpha}$ which is quoted from Am. 9^{13}. In 4^{16} he had quoted from Am. 1^{2}. In v. ^{19b} a significant phrase of Ob. ^{10} is used and commented on. 4^{21a} belongs indissolubly with v. ^{19b}; and v. ^{21b} is very much like 4^{17} and 2^{27} which are both by the editor. 4^{20} may have been suggested by Am. 9^{15}, *cf.* also the editor's hope in 2^{27b} and Am. 9^{12}, though the terms used in v. ^{19a} are favourite terms of Ezekiel. 4^{18b} is based on Ez. $47^{1\,ff.}$. $4^{18a\beta}$ seems to look back to 1^{20}. The difference between Joel's poetic but accurate statement of natural fertility in $2^{21\,ff.}$ and the hyperbolic description of the fertility of the golden age in 4^{18} is instructive.—All this indicates that the whole conclusion (4^{18-21}) comes from the editor whose fondness for quotations from other prophets we have already noted. We have also observed that the editor is not over-particular in his style, and that he changes occasionally from one person to the other in an abrupt way, *cf.* 2^{27} 4^{17}, so that the sudden appearance of the first person in v. ^{21a}, which should stand directly after v. ^{19}, need not surprise us since it is in line with his other work. But even so it is not impossible that v. $^{19b\beta.\,21a}$ are still later insertions.

Thus far we have seen that 4^{14b-21} are by the editor. We must now investigate for how much more he is responsible.

4^{2a} is so closely connected in thought and expression with vv. $^{9-14a}$ that it appears to have belonged with it from the outset, although the thought is repeated in slightly different phraseology in v. ^{12}. That v. ^{2a} forms an appropriate introduction to vv. $^{9-14a}$ cannot be denied. The metre is different, but we expect that, for the trimeter or hexameter is more appropriate for v. ^{2a} than the staccato rhythm of vv. $^{9\,ff.}$.

It is, however, not so evident that v. ^{2b} (from *on account of my people Israel* on) and v. ^{3} belong to Joel. They are only apparently inseparable from v. ^{2a}, in reality they are not in harmony with it. For according to v. ^{2a} the judgment is universal, on all the nations, and is described as such also in vv. $^{9 ff.}$. But in vv. $^{2b.\,3}$ the scope is narrower. Not all the nations were guilty of the cruel treatment of the Jews here charged against them. As a reason for the punishment of all, this would therefore hardly do. It is true that in later literature the cruel treatment of Israel is given as a reason for the punishment of the nations, but then not merely the conquerors and destroyers of Jerusalem are meant but all those nations among whom the Jews were scattered and by whom they had been treated with scorn and hatred. And those who had not known Israel are excepted from destruction. Here the reference, however, is definitely to the conquest of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans in 586 B.C. Moreover, the rarely used phrase *they cast lots* in v. ^{3} reminds us of Ob. ^{11}. And we remember that the editor had used phrases from Obadiah in $4^{17.\,20}$. All this makes it very probable that vv. $^{2b.\,3}$ are also part of the editor's work.

The observation that the editor used Obadiah suggests that 3^{5} with its direct quotation from Ob. ^{17} (to authenticate the statement that every true Yahweh-worshipper would be safe on that great day) is also from him. This is made probable also by a comparison with 4^{16} where the editor's interest is also centred in the protection of Israel.

The difference of $3^{1\text{-}4a}$ where Yahweh Himself speaks and $3^{4b.\,5}$ which are by the editor suggests that $3^{1\text{-}4a}$ are not by the editor but by Joel. And this impression is strengthened by the originality of the thought and the effective manner in which it introduces the final judgment, for which see the commentary. Taking this into account there is no adequate reason for doubting the genuineness of $3^{1\text{-}4a}$.—The insertion of $3^{4b.\,5}$ necessitated a new introduction (4^{1}) by the editor, who is probably also responsible for the editorial link in 3^{1}, *and it shall come to pass afterwards*. and possibly also for *in those days* in 3^{2}, *cf.* the same phrase in 4^{1}.

We have come to the conclusion that $3^{1\text{-}4a}$ $4^{2a.\,9\text{-}14a}$ are by Joel. There remains the examination of the digression in $4^{4\text{-}8}$. Though these verses are at once recognised as a digression they are not unconnected with $4^{2.\,3}$. The sale of Jewish captives by the victorious Babylonian soldiers had been referred to in v. ^{3}. The slave-traders to whom they sold them, so we may supply, were the Phœnicians and the Philistines who had carried on slave-trade for centuries, *cf.* Am. $1^{6.\,9}$ Ez. 27^{13}, also later 1 Mac. 3^{41} 2 Mac. 8^{11}. So this announcement of retribution seemed to the writer very appropriate in this place. It seemed to carry on the thought quite naturally, for these verses do not charge the Phœnicians and Philistines with an actual attack upon the Jews but with taking away their treasures and valuables and with selling Jews into slavery to the Greeks.

They came as merchants and slave-traders to whom the soldiers sold their captives and for whose wares they exchanged their booty. That they profited immensely by these transactions was a matter of course. Thus we must interpret, if this section is the direct continuation of vv. $^{2.3}$. But there is no reference elsewhere to such activity of the Phœnicians and Philistines in 586 B.C. and it is most improbable in the light of Ezekiel's silence on this point in his oracle against Tyre, although he speaks of its slave-trade with Greece (27^{13}). We should doubtless have had a mention of it in 26^{2}, where Tyre's joy over Jerusalem's fall, and in 28^{24}, where Sidon's relation to Israel are spoken of, if the Phœnicians had made themselves so obnoxious to the Jews at that time. The same holds true of Phœnicia in 25^{15}.—It has sometimes been supposed that the Phœnicians and Philistines were meant in vv. $^{2.3}$, but there is no reference anywhere in all the history of Israel and Judah to a conquest of Israel by the combined forces of Phœnicia and Philistia and of a dispersing of Israel by them among the nations or of a parcelling out of the land of Israel among themselves. The identification of vv. $^{2.3}$ with the plundering of Jerusalem by the Philistines and Arabians in 2 Ch. $21^{16 f.}$ under Jehoram does not do justice to the words of these verses, even if the objection that the Phœnicians did not participate in that raid were not conclusive. The direct address, moreover, in 4^{1} mentioning the Phœnicians and Philistines in addition (וגם) and singling them out especially indicates that they are not meant in vv. $^{2.3}$. Their wrong is defined in vv. $^{5.6}$ and according to the whole tenor of the passage they are not the conquerors of vv. $^{2.3}$. Since they did not get the treasures and valuables of the Jews and the captives from the Babylonian soldiers who are quite clearly referred to in vv. $^{2.3}$, we must conclude that vv. $^{4-8}$ refer to some other time than 586 B.C., and that they were not originally the continuation of v. ^{3} but a later insertion. And the literary fact that vv. $^{4-8}$ interrupt the connection between vv. $^{1-3}$ and vv. $^{9 ff.}$ most awkwardly, points in the same direction. The context has a much wider horizon, and vv. $^{4-8}$ are not easily harmonised with it. The universal judgment in the valley of Jehoshaphat, executed by Yahweh Himself, must embrace the Phœnicians and Philistines also. But here in vv. $^{4-8}$ they are to receive a special punishment. And it is not that they are to be exterminated but that they are to be sold into slavery by Israel! 4^{4-8} give no indication of being aware that the judgment on all the nations is coming so soon, that it is already announced. In other words, vv. $^{4-8}$ are out of line with their context.—It is true, of course, that apocalyptics are not always consistent and that a reference to their own historical situation frequently comes in where we do not expect it. But even with this clearly in mind it does not seem to me likely that the author of vv. $^{1-3.9 ff.}$ was responsible for vv. $^{4-8}$. They have grown out of a situation when the Phœnicians and Philistines had but recently done to the Jews the things charged against them. And it is perhaps possible to suggest this situation more definitely. See com.

We must turn once more to the composition of ch. 2. Sievers regards 2^{12-14} as belonging to the secondary material because he finds in them a mixture of external and religio-ethical views of repentance which he cannot attribute to Joel but only to a wholly inferior intellect. But Sievers sees here contradictions which in religious practice need not exist at all. Outward form may well be filled with spirit. The verses are really quite important for the true understanding of $1^{13.\ 14}$.

According to Duhm the appendix begins at 2^{18}, and Sievers also regards 2^{19-27} as secondary. This seems to me unjustifiable. Why should the prophet not have added the outcome of the intercession? Compare the similar case of Haggai. Who else but Joel should have added this promise which fitted only that particular time? What reason could another have had for doing this? And why should this other have given it in the form of a divine oracle? Are we to suppose that a later writer who knew nothing of the peculiar circumstances of Joel's time sat down and wrote a promise, which he put into Yahweh's mouth, simply because he knew that the plague had passed away, since the people were still in existence? Moreover, the song in vv. $^{21-24}$ bears the stamp of originality. Not only its rhythmic beauty but also its phraseology are Joel's own. And its origin can be explained by the reversal of the circumstances of chs. 1, 2 as by nothing else. We would be glad if we knew the circumstances out of which the Psalms arose as well as we know those that gave rise to this song.

Our conclusion is (1) that Joel wrote chs. 1, 2 (except 1^{15} $2^{1b.\ 2.\ 6.\ 10.\ 11.\ 27}$) and also 3^{1-4a} $4^{2a.\ 9-14a}$; (2) that an editor wrote the remainder, connecting chs. 1, 2 with chs. 3, 4 by a series of interpolations which are characterised, as all his work is, by dependence on other prophecies; and (3) that 4^{4-8} are a still later insertion.

§ 2. THE DATE OF THE BOOK.

Since the book is not a unity we must try to determine the date of Joel, of the eschatological editor and of the author of 4^{4-8}.

1. No date is given in the superscription, nor is there any reference to Joel in other books which would fix his time. There is no mention of foreign nations in Joel's own work which would suggest at least the era, Assyrian or Babylonian, Persian or Greek. And

the position of Joel in the series of the minor prophets "does no more," even according to Kirkpatrick (p. 58), "than create a presumption that, at the time when that collection was made, he was thought to have lived at an early period." We must therefore rely solely on internal evidence.

It is at once worth noticing that only Judah and Jerusalem are in Joel's mind. He does not speak of N. Israel a single time. This would be almost inexplicable if N. Israel still existed in his day, for the locust plague and the drought cannot have been confined to Judah. But the land that he deals with comprises only Judah and Jerusalem, and it appears that every single member of the people can attend the assembly at the temple so that the nation can hardly have been at the height of its power. Joel does not speak of a king either, or of royal princes, as we might reasonably have expected in connection with the calling of the assembly which everybody was to attend, if there had been a ruling king and royal princes in Jerusalem at that time. He mentions only elders (1^{14}) and priests as officials. And the priests are prominent.

With this goes an emphasis on the daily cult and the value of daily sacrifices and on the importance of the regularity of the temple services which stands in striking contrast to the attitude of the pre-exilic prophets. And all this centres in the temple of Jerusalem, no other sanctuaries are named and no hint is given that any of the ancient much combated sanctuaries outside of Jerusalem are still in existence. Nor is mention made of idolatry on the part of the people. It is true that Joel does not rebuke them for moral and social sins either, so that this point may not count for much. But people and congregation are coextensive terms (2^{16}) and the priests are called *ministers of Yahweh*, a name much in use in the later literature but not in the earlier.

All this points to the postexilic period. The non-mention of the high priest does not argue against this, for in a late, strictly parallel, passage in Mac. 7^{36}, he is not mentioned either. The linguistic evidence also points to a postexilic date.

משרתי יהוה (1^{9} 2^{17}), a common phrase in later but not in pre-exilic writings.—שלח (2^{8}), elsewhere only in late books, Chronicles, Nehemiah, Job.—סוף (2^{20}), an Aram. word, Dn. $4^{8.\ 19}$, etc., in Heb. only in Chronicles and

Ecclesiastes.—צחנה (2^{20}), only here in OT., has the same meaning in Ec. 11^{12}, 𝔗 and NH.

The argument based on the use of רמח (4^{10}), אלה (1^{8}), נאנחה (1^{18}), הנחת is (4^{11}) invalidated by the observation that רמח, though used mostly by Nehemiah and Chronicles, occurs also in Ju. 5^{8} 1 K. 18^{28}, and that the other three words are most probably due to textual corruption.

The literary relation of Joel to other writers also argues for a postexilic date. It will be remembered from our discussion of the composition of the book that all the direct literary dependencies are due to the editor. Joel himself is only indirectly, unconsciously influenced by other writers, but this makes this argument quite valuable.

4^{10} might be regarded as directly dependent on Is. 2^{4} (Mi. 4^{3}). But this is hardly likely, even if Is. 2^{4} should be earlier. The phrase as used by Joel must have been quite common, describing as it did actual practice, while the reversed use by Is. 2^{4} is not so natural. In Is. 2^{4} it is due to the well-known prophetic habit of painting the ideal future by contrasting it with the actual present. Neither Joel nor Isaiah nor Micah need therefore have had in mind the other when writing their oracle.—But the phrases *turn unto Me with your whole heart* and *rend your hearts rather than your garments*, in 2^{12}, show the influence of Jeremiah's and Deuteronomy's characteristic teaching.—Similarly the phrase *Why should they say among the nations, Where is their God?* has exilic and postexilic affinities (Ps. 79^{10} 115^{2} $42^{3.\,10}$). "The dread displayed for the taunting attitude of the nations," says Dr., "is characteristic of the period which began with the exile of Judah from its land, and its diminished prestige, which continued even after its restoration under Cyrus." See also 2^{19}.—The phrase, *I will pour out* (אשפך) *my Spirit* ($3^{1.\,2}$) shows affinity to Ez. 39^{29}, the only other instance where the same Heb. phrase *I will pour out* occurs with the personal sf. added in *My Spirit*. Cp. the similar use in Deutero-Isaiah, *I will give My Spirit* (42^{1}), *I will pour out* (אצק) *My Spirit* (44^{3}).—Jo. 2^{3} may also have been influenced by Ez. 36^{35} (cp. Is. 51^{3}).—The literary antecedent of the world judgment before Jerusalem is Ez. 38 *f.*, and, if genuine, Zp. 3^{8}, *i. e.*, prophecies written either during or a few decades before the exile.

How far down in the postexilic period we may go is not easy to determine. The temple was already built and the cult had been carried on apparently for a considerable time. Moreover, the wall of the city had also been built, if we interpret 2^{9} correctly. This would take us to the time after Nehemiah. If Joel had lived in

Nehemiah's own time we might perhaps have expected a reference to the Samaritans and the Ammonites. But neither they nor any other nations are mentioned by Joel himself, the judgment is on *all* the nations. This points to a time when there were no actual present enemies of the nation but when all nations were regarded as hostile. A *terminus ad quem* may perhaps be given by the date of the editor or of the author of 4^{4-8}.

2. The editor's date must, of course, be postexilic if the book he edited belonged to that period. And all indications are in line with this. He also is only interested in Judah and Jerusalem and does not even think of N. Israel in his picture of the golden future. The capture of Jerusalem and the dispersion of the Jews are accomplished facts ($4^{2b.\,3}$). He does not speak of a return from the exile, because he evidently presupposes it. The phrase in 4^1, sometimes translated *bring back the captivity*, means really *restore the fortune.*

The literary relation of the editor to other prophets agrees with this. He is not, like Joel, an original writer, but is given to quoting. He knew and used Amos, Zephaniah, Ezekiel, Is. 13, Am. 9, Deutero-Isaiah, Malachi and Obadiah.

That the editor of Joel quoted from them is clear. (1) The direct quotation from Ob. ^{17} in 3^5, which is introduced as such, shows it. This carries with it the judgment that in the other passages which are parallel to Obadiah the dependence is on the part of the editor of Joel. In 4^{17} a sentence from Ob. ^{17} is quoted and commented upon. In 4^{19b} a pregnant phrase is taken from Ob. ^{10}, in 4^{3a} a phrase from Ob. ^{11} (which is used elsewhere only in Na. 3^{10}). (2) The use of *characteristic* phrases of Ezekiel and the Holiness Code in 2^{27} 4^{17} argues for the editor's dependence. (3) The unrelatedness of the passages in Joel and their indispensableness in the parallels is another strong argument of the same kind. In Zp. $1^{14.\,15}$ the parallel words form a climax and are indispensable, while in Jo. $2^{1b.\,2}$ they are unrelated and secondary. Similarly in 1^{15} and Is. 13^6. With Is. 13 also 2^6 is related, *cf.* Is. $13^{10.\,13}$; and 4^{15} with Is. 13^{13}.—These considerations indicate that the editor of Joel was the quoter also in other cases. Thus he is indebted to Ez. 47 for the thought of the river flowing from the temple, to Am. 9^{13} for the phrase in 4^{18}, to Mal. 3^{23} in 2^{11} 3^{4b}.

According to this literary comparison the editor of Joel wrote later than Malachi and Obadiah, and this is what we should expect, for Joel's date was, as we saw, after Nehemiah. The relation between him and Zc. 14 is a little more difficult. That there is a strong resemblance and affinity cannot be questioned, cp. Jo. $4^{2.\ 9\ \text{ff.}}$ with Zc. $14^{2.\ 3.\ 12}$, Jo. 4^{15} with Zc. $14^{6.\ 7}$, Jo. 4^{18} with Zc. 14^{8}. We have come to the conclusion that Zc. 14 is dependent on Jo. 4 in regard to the location of the judgment scene and the direction of the wonderful river. See com.

The editor does not mention the Samaritans and the Ammonites either. His reference to Edom, under the influence of Obadiah and Am. 9, does not help us much for it does not indicate a special hostile activity on the part of Edom at that time. Egypt also is mentioned, though perhaps in a later gloss, not as an important enemy but in order to bring out the glorious fertility of Judah by contrasting it with Egypt's and Edom's desolation. The matter is entirely different with the Phœnicians and Philistines in 4^{4-8}.—From the non-mention of the Persians we may probably conclude with good reason that the attack by Artaxerxes Ochus had not yet taken place. If this reasoning is tenable the editor must have written before the middle of the 4th cent. B.C.

3. Where can we find a place for 4^{4-8} in the postexilic period? It would seem that this passage also belongs to the Persian period, for the awful fate which befell Sidon (*c.* 348 B.C.) at the hands of Artaxerxes III, when more than 40,000 people perished (Diodorus Siculus, XIV, 45), and the fate of Tyre in 322 B.C. at the hands of Alexander the Great who sold the entire surviving population into slavery (Diodorus Siculus, XVII, 46; Arrian, II, 24), and the fate of Gaza in the same year, when Alexander sold the entire population into slavery, had not yet occurred, else there would have been some reference to them, unless we were to place the section late in the Greek period when these awful disasters were no longer fresh in the minds of the people. The Maccabean period, however, is excluded by the non-mention of Aram.

The mention of the Greeks as simple slave-traders and not as a great world power is not favourable to a date in the Greek period. Phœnicia and Gaza had commercial relations with Greece as early as the Persian period, if not earlier; for Phœnicia, *cf.* Ez. 27^{13}; for Gaza, *cf.* the use of coins with partly Phœnician and partly Greek inscriptions during this era (Schürer, II,[3] p. 84, with references). No objection can therefore be made to the Persian era on this ground.

, Little is known of the history of the Jewish people in the Persian period from the time of Nehemiah on. But from the little we do know it would seem, on the whole, most probable that the Phœnicians and Philistines took advantage of the conquest of Jerusalem by Artaxerxes Ochus to procure treasures and slaves from the Persians. A considerable number of Jews were made captive and settled in Hyrcania, near the Caspian Sea, *cf.* p. 45. And it is not unlikely that the Phœnicians and Philistines bought others from the Persian soldiers and sold them into slavery at that time.

It is true, the Phœnicians were hostile to the Persians and we might think that they aided Judah, if not actually, at least with their sympathy. But they had not yet revolted; not for a year or two later did they do so. And how little their commercial instinct allowed them to sympathise with Judah in the time of her distress is seen from Ez. 26[1] where the same Phœnicians who but a short time before had tried to persuade Judah to join them and others in a revolt against Nebuchadrezzar (Je. 27[3]), and who were attacked by Nebuchadrezzar soon after 586 B.C., rejoiced over Jerusalem's fall because they believed it would be to their own personal advantage.

If our arguments prove to be correct, the singling out of the Phœnicians and Philistines as special foes of Judah is explained, and the non-mentioning of the Persians is due to the belief of the inserter of 4[4-8] that they were definitely referred to in vv. [2. 3].

The insertion would then have been made shortly after the capture of Jerusalem by Artaxerxes Ochus (*c.* 352 B.C.), and before the fall of Sidon in 348 B.C.

The use of the form בני היונים (4[6]) for the older form בני יון is a literary indication that 4[4-8] belongs to the period of the Chronicler who uses such forms, *e. g.*, בני הכחתים for בני קחת and בני הקרחים for בני קרח.

The book of Joel was, according to this, completed by the middle of the 4th cent. B.C. If we place Joel himself at about 400 B.C.

and the editor a few decades later we shall probably not be far off the mark.

There has been a great variety of opinions concerning the date of Joel. The early Jewish scholars who put Joel into the canon probably thought he belonged with the early pre-exilic prophets. Later Jewish scholars, *e. g.*, Rashi and Kimchi, thought the date could not be fixed. But scholarship does not easily rest content with such a conclusion though later Calvin and Pococke agreed with it. The position in the canon was held to be decisive by Theodoret, Jerome, *et al.*, who made Joel a contemporary of Hosea on the principle that a prophet whose book was not dated belongs in time with the preceding prophet.—Among modern scholars the most varied dates have been assigned to Joel, ranging from the time of Rehoboam through all the succeeding centuries down to the 4th cent. B.C. It was impossible for scholars to come to an agreement. Once, indeed, it seemed as if the question were settled, when Credner, in 1831, had marshalled his arguments for the period of the minority of Joash. Though Vatke a few years later, in 1835, suggested a postexilic date, Credner's position appeared impregnable. But in 1866 Hilgenfeld argued for the Persian era, and then Seinecke and Duhm (1875) also. But it was not till 1879 that the position of the postexilic date was firmly established. The credit for this belongs to Merx. Since then it has become the prevailing view of critics. But even to-day some still prefer a pre-exilic date, *e. g.*, Kirkpatrick, Orelli, König, Cameron, *et al.*—The whole question has assumed a different aspect with the recognition of the composite character of the book. Vernes refused at first to fix a date for either chs. 1, 2 or chs. 3, 4, but in 1880 he placed all in the 4th cent. B.C. Rothstein assigned chs. 1, 2 to the time of Joash, chs. 3, 4 after the exile. Ryssel inclined to the time before Amos for chs. 1, 2, and to the time of the Ptolemies for chs. 3, 4. Duhm thinks that the original book of Joel belongs most probably to the 4th cent. B.C., but the appendix much later.

§ 3. THE INTERPRETATION OF THE BOOK.

1. Some time toward the beginning of the fourth century or the end of the fifth, a locust swarm visited Judah, greater and more ominous it seemed than any that had ever come before. Judah was but a small land without large resources and a disaster like this threatened its very existence.

With great vividness Joel describes the approach of the vast swarm which he compares to an invading army. He paints the scene with his forcible, graphic style so that we see it clearly before us. The call rings out to sound the alarm. Already the locusts cover the mountains and have begun their work of destruction. Swiftly the prophet sketches their appearance and with the expressive rhythmic staccato movement of his sentences he pictures their rapid advance and their irresistible attack upon the city itself. Now they have taken it. The danger is at its height. But even yet there is hope! the prophet declares. The worst may yet be averted. Yahweh had sent the plague as a discipline and punishment. If the people repent with all their hearts He will have mercy upon them. And so Joel appeals to them to repent. This is his first address which is contained in $2^{1a.\ 3-9.\ 12-14}$.

But the plague was not stopped, one swarm after another invaded and ravaged the country and left it waste and desolate. To aggravate the calamity a drought accompanied the locusts. All hope for a new growth had died, and the cry of despair went all through the land. Only one could help in this crisis, Yahweh! And so Joel calls for a great penitential assembly where all the people should implore Yahweh for pardon and help.—This is his address in ch. 1.—Here his descriptive power is seen at its height. It is one of the finest pieces of poetic description in the OT. with its grim humour in calling on the drunkards, its exquisite pathos in the comparison of the young widowed bride, its lifelike portrayal of the various classes and the quick, keen characterisation of the locusts, its touching appeal of the animals to Yahweh, its sketch of the ruin and desolation made unforgettable by the concrete touches of his pen.

Moved by Joel's appeal the priests called the people together to an ever memorable meeting. Every single member of the community came, from the greatest to the least, from the oldest to the youngest. Then the priests voiced the need of the people in prayer (2^{15-17}). The quick, concise and pregnant manner of telling this is very effective. The language becomes calmer when Joel speaks of the prayer, and of the answer of Yahweh, as is fitting. Yahweh heard and answered with a promise of restored fertility and of compensation for the loss caused by the locusts. And then after some time had elapsed and the signs of the fulfilment of

Yahweh's promise had appeared the prophet sings in conclusion the praise of Yahweh in lyrical strains of joy which for beauty are comparable to Deutero-Isaiah's lyrical interludes ($2^{21-24.\ 26a\,\beta}$).

This interpretation assumes that the chronological order of the sections of chs. 1, 2 is 2^{1-14} 1^{5-20} $2^{15\,\mathrm{ff}}$; that the narrative begins in 2^{15} not in 2^{18}, and that $2^{21-24.\ 26a\,\beta}$ followed originally $2^{15-20.\ 25.\ 26a\alpha}$.

2. It is not certain, but probable, that Joel wrote also 3^{1-4a} $4^{2a.\ 9-14a}$, not at the same time but perhaps later than chs. 1, 2. This time he described Yahweh's judgment of the nations. It was after the exile, the Jews had passed through much suffering, they had been judged by Yahweh; even in Joel's own day the awful locust plague had come as one of Yahweh's judgments. But it would not come again, Yahweh had promised. Now the judgment would come on the nations. Just why it was that Joel thought of the judgment of the nations, whether it was because they had mocked Judah about her calamity (2^{17}) or for some other reason, we do not know. He speaks of the future in prophetic tones. It will be a far more terrible crisis than men have ever experienced. Great excitement will prevail among all classes and ages of society. People will foresee in dreams and visions, and foretell in ecstatic tones, the coming judgment. Extraordinary signs in heaven and on earth will appear as warnings that the day is at hand. And Yahweh will gather all nations into the valley of Jehoshaphat where He will judge them. In dramatic manner He gives command that they be summoned in full force and heavily armed for the final conflict and judgment which Yahweh will render seated in majestic calmness on his judgment seat in the Valley of Decision. This time it is not the advance of the locust army that Joel describes, but the preparations for war among the nations and their summons to the judgment valley, but again his characteristic style appears, that graphic, concrete style of his with its staccato movement (3^{1-4a} $4^{2a.\ 9-14a}$).

Joel had left his addresses in chs. 1, 2 and in chs. 3, 4 unconnected. But soon after him an editor brought them together. His mind was full of eschatological thoughts and phrases, and his interest centred in the future. So he interpreted chs. 1, 2 in the light of chs. 3, 4. To him the locusts were not literal locusts but more, they were Yahweh's agents of judgment and the advance guard of His day. They were the great northern hosts, predicted by former prophets, mighty nations who would come to execute Yahweh's judgment on Israel. But they would overstep the limits of their authority and would then be punished themselves. To the editor's mind the whole was still future, chs. 1, 2 were also prediction. By a series of interpolations he transformed the addresses concerning the locust plague and drought into eschatological chapters.

In chs. 3, 4 also he added explanatory sentences or descriptive eschatological material taken from the earlier prophets sometimes almost *verbatim*. He laid stress on the protection of the Jews at the time of the judgment of the nations and fortified his point by quotations (3^{5} 4^{16b}). He supplied the description of the conflict ($4^{15\,\mathrm{f.}}$). And in beautiful, if not original, phrases he pictured the perpetual safety and wonderful prosperity of Judah after the judgment ($4^{17\text{-}21}$). As a result of his activity we have a little compendium of eschatology in the book of Joel. It is due to him that the eschatological interpretation of the locusts has so often been insisted upon. The book, as we now have it, is indeed an eschatological work.

3. When Joel and the editor lived there were no special nations troubling Judah. The judgment was to come on them all. But about half a century, or less, later another writer took occasion to insert an oracle against the Phœnicians and Philistines who had made themselves odious to the Jews, if we interpret correctly, at the time of the capture of Jerusalem by Artaxerxes Ochus. They had taken the gold and silver and precious possessions of the Jews and had sold Jewish captives to the Greeks as slaves far away from their home. Quickly this will be requited in accordance with the *lex talionis*. History knows of the terrible fulfilment of this prediction.

The history of interpretation follows in the main two lines. The one takes the locusts literally as real locusts, the other allegorically as representing invading nations. The literal interpretation thinks of the calamity as having taken place in Joel's own time, the allegorical interpretation, as a rule, refers it to the future. The allegorists have not always agreed on which nations were meant. 𝔗 explained the *northerner* by *that nation which comes from the north* and the four names of the locusts by *nations, peoples, tongues, sultans and kingdoms*, without committing itself to a more definite identification. But church fathers as well as Jewish rabbis and many scholars down to modern times identified the locusts with the four invasions of the Assyrians and Babylonians under Tiglath-pileser, Shalmaneser, Sennacherib, Nebuchadrezzar (Ephraem) or simply with the Babylonians (Jerome), or with (1) the Assyrians and Babylonians, (2) the Medes and Persians, (3) the Macedonians and Diadochoi, (4) the Romans (so Jewish scholars at Jerome's time, later also, *e.g.*, Abarbanel, and early Christian scholars like Cyril and modern scholars like Hengstenberg and Pusey). Hilgenfeld identified the locusts with the four Persian invasions, of Cambyses, Xerxes, and the two of Artaxerxes Ochus. Some of the allegorists (*e.g.*, Theodoret and the Jews at the time of Jerome) believed that there had also been a real locust plague in Joel's time. Merx explained the locusts as apocalyptic warriors, unearthly beings which belong to the wonders of the time of the end (Rev. 9^{3-11}).

We can understand why the allegorical interpretation in spite of all its difficulties has persisted through the centuries. For after all the arguments of the literalists there remained certain points which could not be harmonised with real locusts. A locust swarm is not accompanied by a thunder-storm, an earthquake and shaking of the heavens, or by the darkening of the sun, moon and stars; nor is the term *my northerner*, in spite of all that may be said, quite suitable for a locust swarm in Palestine; and it can hardly be said of locusts that they have *acted overweeningly*, for they cannot be held responsible for their acts.

Nevertheless the arguments for interpreting the locusts literally are so strong that they cannot be resisted. Joel's description in all its details corresponds exactly to the descriptions of ancient and modern travellers and authors and excludes a devastation caused by soldiers. They devour the vines and strip the bark of the trees. There is no reference to shedding of blood, to plundering and destroying of cities, and no word about captives. The locusts are described under the figure of warriors not *vice versa*, else horsemen would be *like* horsemen! The description of the annihilation of the army corresponds with facts actually witnessed in connection with locusts but not with soldiers. And when the restoration is described, only damage done to the ground and restored fertility are mentioned, but not the rebuilding of cities and the healing of the ravages of war.

The elements which are irreconcilable with real locusts are explained by the literalists as due to the feeling of the prophet that the locusts are the forerunners of the day of Yahweh. The fear of its approach is awakened by this awful, unparalleled locust plague. Yahweh is coming to judge His people, the locusts herald His advent.

But the essential unrelatedness of the day of Yahweh passages in their context has proved them to be interpolations. And henceforth we must carefully distinguish between the original book of Joel and the book which has been worked over.

For the history of interpretation see Merx's essay in his commentary which is of permanent value.

§ 4. THE PROPHET.

Nothing is known of Joel outside of his book. He was the son of Pethuel, or Bethuel, who is otherwise unknown. His name contains a confession of faith, *Yahweh is God!* and may reflect the piety of his parents. But there is not the challenge in the historical situation that there is in the similar name Elijah, *My God is Yahweh!* For there is no trace that the people of his day were idolators, and our prophet was not the first bearer of this rather frequent name.

A tradition given in Pseudo-Epiphanius, *Vitæ Prophetarum* and at the end of $\mathfrak{G}^{22}$ says that Joel belonged to the tribe of Reuben, but his book argues against it. According to the whole impression it makes Joel was a Judean, for his interest is exclusively in Judah. Whether his home was in Jerusalem or in the immediate vicinity we do not know. It has been surmised that he was a Jerusalem priest, but this cannot be proved from his profound interest in the temple, priests and ritual, for he does not include himself among the priests in $1^{13.\ 14}$ 2^{17}.

Joel does not remind us of the great pre-exilic prophets. He has no word of rebuke for his people. There is no rousing of their consciences by a sharp reminder of their sins, social, moral or religious. Yet he is not indifferent to this, he does not speak of sin because he assumes a quickened conscience which the hard blows of disaster had stung into life. He speaks to people who, he believes, know that they have sinned and who realise that Yahweh has sent the plague as a discipline. He assumes the need of repentance for all and summons them to it.—He believes in the efficacy of united prayer and fasting, of the temple services and ritual, in the value of outward means and symbols. We should call him to-day a churchman. But we must not overestimate his emphasis on the external side of religion. The heart of the matter is also for him the attitude of the spirit. Fasting and sackcloth he does not reject, but they are not enough. Repentance is a matter of the heart, and it must be sincere and thorough-going, if it is to avail at all.

Joel does not rise to the greatness of Job's faith that communion with God does not depend on outward blessings, he believes that both outward and inward blessings go together and that the true condition is that which experiences divine grace in the sacrament of material prosperity. He has sometimes been called the Prophet of Pentecost because of his prediction of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. But the scope of this prophecy is not universal and its meaning is not so profoundly spiritual as has usually been thought. It does not imply the spiritual and moral transformation of the recipients but is one of the preliminary signs of the day of Yahweh.

Joel was no great thinker and no great prophet. But he was a poet, and a poet of no mean order. His style is clear, fluent and beautiful. The lyrical quality of some of his lines places them among the best of their kind in the OT., while his graphic, terse descriptions are exceedingly effective. He varies the rhythmic movement of his sentences with his changing thought and mood. This gives to his addresses a beautiful harmony of form and content. We do not wonder that the people listened to him as the sweet, plaintive cadences of his beautiful lines or the swift, galloping staccato utterances of his unforgettable descriptions or of his stirring appeals fell on their ears. Nor do we wonder that they obeyed his command, voicing as it did their own feelings. He knew himself to be one of them, their spokesman, but also the spokesman of God.

§ 5. THE TEXT AND METRE.

The text of Joel is well preserved and no special discussion of it is needed here. The textcritical points are all considered in the notes.

The book is written in metre, as Eichhorn showed already in 1816 in his beautiful, rhythmic rendering, but apparently without strophic regularity. There are, of course, thought divisions and these may be regarded as strophes. But to divide these again into strophes of equal length does not seem warranted, for we have no means of knowing whether Joel was as much interested in strophic regularity as we are.

There is no uniformity of metre either. Hexameters, pentameters, tetrameters are all used in the book, the last is usually a hexameter or pentameter purposely left uncompleted, it seems. The most characteristic rhythm of Joel is the staccato movement of the tetrameter which he uses with wonderful success, *e. g.*, in $2^{5.\ 7-9}$ where its quick movement is beautifully appropriate, or in 1^{4} $2^{15.\ 16}$ where it accentuates the terseness of the lines, or in $1^{13.\ 14}$ 4^{9-14a} where it heightens the stirring effect, or in $1^{8-12.\ 16.\ 19.\ 20}$ where the plaintive melody appears as if interrupted by sobs.—But the tetrameter was not always the best vehicle of Joel's thoughts and feelings. *E. g.*, in 2^{12-14} after the rapid movement of $2^{5.\ 7-9}$ the staccato movement had to be given up as inappropriate to the pleading tones of the prophet, and the hexameter is used instead. It is also resorted to when Joel addresses the people in more measured tones, $1^{2.\ 5.\ 13a}$, or when the promise of the deity is recited, $2^{18-20.\ 25.\ 26a\alpha}$, also 2^{12}.—Similarly the pentameter movement follows, *e. g.*, in 2^{17}, with much appropriateness upon the quick tetrameters of $2^{15.\ 16}$.

We see, Joel changes the rhythm of his speech in accordance with his mood and thought. This gives to his words much life and feeling. But it must make us cautious in applying a metrical norm to questions of genuineness. However, the authenticity of 4^{9-14a} is made more probable by the metrical argument than it otherwise would be, for in 4^{9-14a} we find the characteristic tetrameter with its staccato style which Joel uses with such telling effect in undoubted passages of chs. 1, 2. It is used here with the same felicity and force.—The metre helps us also to exclude certain additions, *e. g.*, in $1^{12.\ 14}$ $2^{7.\ 9}$. But further than this it does not help us in distinguishing between authentic and secondary material. For the editorial additions are also in metre, most of them having been taken from other prophets who also wrote in rhythm. And since Joel did not confine himself to one metre even within the single sections we cannot argue for or against authenticity simply on the basis of his metric scheme.

The two most noteworthy contributions to the question of the metre are by Sievers and by Duhm.

Sievers arranges the book in accordance with his metrical principles into seven sections: I, $1^{2.3.5-9a.13ac}$ 2^{15-17} in two-line pentameter strophes; II, $1^{4.10.9b.13b.14.16.17a}$ $2^{3e.5b.9}$ in two-line strophes of the metric form 8 : 4; III, $1^{11a.12b.11b.12a.17b.18a.19b.18b.19a.20}$ in two-line heptameter strophes; IV, $2^{1b.2.4.5a.7.8.11a.10a.11b.11d\,11c}$ in two-line pentameter strophes; V, $4^{9b.10b.12-14}$ in two-line strophes of the metric form 8 : 4; VI, 4^{16} $2^{3.6.10b.1a}$ 4^{10a} in two-line hexameter strophes; VII, $2^{12-14.18-27}$ 3^{1-5} $4^{1-8.17-21}$ in heptameters without strophic grouping.—Of these sections he regards VII as secondary.

Here, as in Obadiah (see pp. 16 *f.*), Siev.'s contribution to the rhythm is most valuable, but here also instead of solving the problem of literary composition by the metre he has arrived at conclusions which are so little likely to commend themselves that one cannot help feeling that the metrical argument should be used with much more caution and restraint. It does not seem credible that passages which form beautifully connected wholes as they stand can be the result of such an artificial and complicated literary process.

The reader of Duhm's translation is impressed by the great metr. and str. regularity of 1^2–2^{17}. The rest of the book Du. prints as a prose appendix. According to him the prophet wrote in strophes usually of four half lines each; only four strophes of the thirty-four have six half lines each. These four consist of 1^4 1^5 $1^{8.12c.16c}$ 1^{10}, and the str. structure is apparently one of Du.'s reasons for separating them from their context and arranging them together in one group. The result is that ch. 1 is rearranged as follows (a) vv. $^{2.3.6.7.9.11.12}$ each verse representing a strophe of four half lines; (b) vv. $^{4.5.8+12c+16c.10}$ four verses (vv. $^{8.12c.16c}$ counting as one) making four strophes of six half lines; (c) vv. $^{13.14.16+17a\alpha.17a\beta b+18a\alpha.18a\beta b+19a.20+19c}$ six strophes of four half lines. More can be adduced in favour of this rearrangement of ch. 1 than simply the metr. argument but it is not convincing. Whether Joel himself intended two or three long lines (equivalent to Du.'s four and six half lines) as a str. unit is more than we can say. In some cases it is obvious, *e. g.*, $1^{4.5}$ (two strophes of three long lines each), in other cases it is probable, *e. g.*, $1^{6.7}$ (two strophes of two long lines each), but just as probably $1^{6.7}$ may form but one strophe. Similarly, *e. g.*, $1^{11.12}$ may form two strophes, but they may also form but one; if two we cannot take v. ^{12c} with the second unless we give up the uniform length of the single strophes. Du. takes v. ^{12c} with another strophe, made up of vv. $^{8.12c.16c}$. But are we sure that Joel was so scrupulous about the uniformity of his strophes? Are we sure, *e. g.*, that 1^{10} must be lengthened out to a strophe of six half lines as Du. does by a conjectural insertion? May not the last half have been left uncompleted with intention? It would be not less effective thus. These are questions which the progress of metr. investigation may eventually answer definitely in Du.'s manner. But at this present stage they are still matters of uncertainty. And so the metr. and str. regularity of Du.'s translation appears to me as not truly representing the original. Nevertheless it brings out most beautifully the rhythmic swing and melody of chs. 1, 2. It is strange that Du. finds no rhythm in chs. 3, 4.

§ 6. MODERN LITERATURE.

(1) *Commentaries on all the Minor Prophets.*—See p. 17.

(2) *Special commentaries on Joel.*—K. A. Credner, *Der Prophet Joel übersetzt und erklärt*, 1831. A. Wünsche, *Die Weissagung des Propheten Joel übersetzt und erklärt*, 1872. A. Merx, *Die Prophetie des Joel und ihre Ausleger*, 1879. Scholz, *Kommentar zum Buche des Propheten Joel*, 1885. S. R. Driver, *The Books of Joel and Amos*, in the *Cambridge Bible*, 1898. J. D. Wynkoop, in Kahana's *Biblia Hebraica*, 1906 (Hebrew). K. Marti, in Kautzsch's *Die Heilige Schrift des A.T.'s*,[3] 1909.

(3) *Special articles.*—Vatke, *Die biblische Theologie wissenschaftlich dargestellt*, I, 1835, pp. 462 *f.* Hilgenfeld, *ZwTh.*, 1866, pp. 412 *ff.; Das Judentum im Persischen Zeitalter.* M. Vernes, *Le Peuple d' Israel et ses Espérances*, 1872, pp. 46–54, 162 *f.; Histoire des Idées Messianiques*, 1874, pp. 13 *f.; Mélanges de Critique Religieuse*, 1880, pp. 218–28. Duhm, *Theologie der Propheten*, 1875, pp. 275–77. A. B. Davidson, *Exp.*, March, 1888, pp. 198 *ff.*, *The Prophet Joel.* Holzinger, *ZAW.*, 1889, pp. 89–131, *Sprachcharakter und Abfassungszeit des Buches Joel.* G. B. Gray, *Exp.*, Sept., 1893, pp. 208 *ff.*, *The Parallel Passages in Joel in Their Bearing on the Question of Date.* J. W. Rothstein, in the German edition of Driver's *Introduction*, 1896, pp. 333 *f.* Kirkpatrick, *The Doctrine of the Prophets*,[2] 1897, pp. 57 *ff.* Cameron, in *DB.*, II, 1899. W. R. Smith (Driver), in *EB.*, II, 1901. Ryssel, in *JE.*, VII, 1904. Bruston, *Les plus anciens Prophètes*, 1907, pp. 16 *ff.* Stocks, *NkZ.*, 1908, pp. 725 *ff.*, *Der "Nördliche" und die Komposition des Buches Joel.*—Besides the Introductions

mentioned on p. 18, cp. Kuenen, *Onderzoek*,^{2} 1889, §§ 68 *f.* Reuss, *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften A.T.'s*,^{2} 1890.

(4) *The text and metre.*—See p. 18. Sievers, *Alttestamentliche Miscellen*, VI, 1907. Oesterley, *JTS.*, 1906, pp. 228–35. Kent, *Student's OT.*, III, 1910, pp. 409 *ff.* Rahmer, *Hieronymus' Commentar zu den zwölf kleinen Propheten*, 1902.

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON THE COMPOSITION OF THE BOOK.

Paul Riessler presents the following theory of the composition of Joel in his new book, *Die Kleinen Propheten oder das Zwölfprophetenbuch nach dem Urtext übersetzt und erklärt* (1911). The original nucleus consisted of $1^{2\text{-}4.\ 8\text{-}12}$ $2^{1\text{-}3}$. To this were joined parallels from messages of Joel which did not belong to the original book, $1^{5\text{-}7.\ 13\text{-}20}$ $2^{15\text{-}17.\ 19.\ 20.\ 27}$ $3^{1.\ 3}$ $4^{1\text{-}3.\ 9.\ 10.\ 12.\ 13.\ 17}$. Still later there were added passages which probably go back in large measure to Joel himself but which had been handed down separately, $2^{4\text{-}9.\ 12\text{-}14.\ 21\text{-}24.\ 26}$ $3^{1.\ 4}$. Besides these, $4^{4\text{-}8.\ 18\text{-}21}$ were inserted from some older author. And finally a number of marginal notes and glosses found their way into the text, 1^2 (*elders*) ^{3} (*to their children and their children*) $^{7b.\ 10b.\ 12}$ (*also palms*, and *yea, joy*, etc.) ^{14} (*old men*) $^{15b.\ 17a\alpha b.\ 18a}$ (*what could we put in them?*) $^{18b.\ 20b\beta}$ $2^{1b.\ 2a\alpha.\ 3b\beta.\ 7a\beta.\ 11.\ 13a\beta b.\ 14b}$ (*meal-offering*, etc.) ^{17} (*that the heathen may not rule over them*) ^{20} (*and its bad odour ascends*) $^{22b.\ 26b}$ $3^{2.\ 3b.\ 5}$ (*even escaped ones*, etc.) 4^8 (*to the Sabeans*, and *for Yahweh has spoken*) $^{11.\ 13}$ (*the vats overflow*) $^{14b.\ 21a}$.

COMMENTARY ON JOEL.

1. The title states merely that a divine communication had come to Joel. No date, not even of the period, no home from which Joel came, no hint to whom the oracle was directed, are given. Nor is the mode described in which Yahweh's revelation came to him. Simply the common superscription, *The word of Yahweh which came to Joel the son of Pethuel*, or *Bethuel*, *cf.* Ho. 1[1] Mi. 1[1] Zp. 1[1]. Its simplicity appears to vouch for its genuineness. There is no reason to suppose that the names are not genuine names of historical persons.

THE AWFUL LOCUST PLAGUE AND DROUGHT (1[2-20]).

After an introduction in which the attention of the people is directed to the unexampled and ever memorable character of the locust plague through which they are now passing (*vv.* [2-4]), *Joel proceeds to a graphic description of the unprecedented devastation of the land by means of the rhetorical device of describing the distress of the various classes; of the wine-bibbers who can no longer enjoy their favourite drink* (*vv.* [5-7]), *of the priests who can no longer bring sacrifices to the altar* (*vv.* [8-10]), *of the husbandmen and vineyard keepers who have lost their harvests* (*vv.* [11-12]). *Then he calls for the remedy and exhorts the priests to make preparations for a great day of public fasting and supplication* (*vv.* [13-14]). *And with the words of a prayer in which he sets forth in moving manner the distress of man and beast he concludes* (*vv.* [16-20]).

V. [15] is an interpolation by the editor who interpreted the locusts as the precursors of the day of Yahweh.

THE UNPRECENTED CHARACTER OF THE PLAGUE AND ITS EXTENT (1[2-4]).

[2] Hear this, ye old men,
  and give ear, all who dwell in the land!
Has the like ever happened in your days,
  or in the days of your fathers?

[3] Tell your children all about it,
  and (let) your children (tell) their children,
And their children the following generation.

[4] That which the shearer left,
  the swarmer has eaten.
And that which the swarmer left,
  the lapper has eaten,
And that which the lapper left,
  the finisher has eaten!

Three introductory strophes, (1) v. [2] a hexameter + a pentameter, (2) v. [3] a pentameter + a trimeter, (3) v. [4] three tetrameters.—Strs. 1 and 2 may be taken as one str.

2–4. Joel did not merely write his addresses but spoke to the assembled people. He addresses the old men, they are not the elders here, because he wants to appeal to their experience and their memory. Their testimony is valuable because they are so very old. *Has anything like this (ever) happened (before) in your life-time or in the days of your fathers?* No! Not even the oldest men can remember having experienced or having heard their fathers tell of anything like it. The whole is so unprecedented that it will long be memorable. So the prophet exhorts them all,—here we see why he addressed at the beginning not only the old men but all the people,—to preserve the memory of it and to hand it down to their children and children's children, with all its particulars. The event, thus far only referred to by *this* and *it*, is explained in v. [4]. A terrible locust plague has visited the land and in successive swarms has totally devoured the herbage and foliage of the country. *Shearer*, *swarmer*, *lapper* and *finisher* are different names for locusts, translated after their probable etymology. The OT. mentions several kinds of locusts by seven different names. Some are synonyms denoting the same species, others denote different stages of the same species, still others different species. Here it is not locusts in the different stages of their development or different species that are meant, but the four names are used to exhaust the category and to describe the completeness of the destruction caused by these successive swarms. What one swarm had left another devoured. In synonyms for locust the Heb. is richer than the English. Whether these successive swarms were confined to a single year or not, see on 2^{25}. Either would be true to nature.

Fr. Alvarez reports, "When we were in the Seignory of Abrigima, in a place called Aquate, there came such a multitude of locusts as cannot be said. They began to arrive one day about terce [nine] and till night they ceased not to arrive; and when they arrived, they bestowed themselves. On the next day at the hour of prime they began to depart, and at mid-day there was not one, and there remained not a leaf on the trees. At this instant others began to come and stayed like the others to the next day at the same hour; and these left not a stick with its bark, nor a green herb, and thus did they five days one after another."—*Das Indias*, ch. 32 (quoted by Pusey). Barrow, on the other hand, speaks of successive years, "The present year is the third of their continuance, and their increase has far exceeded that of a geometrical progression whose ratio is a million."—*S. Africa*, p. 257 (Pu.).

1. יואל = יו + אל = *Yahweh is God.* This is the best explanation. Other proposals see in BDB. Cp. אֵלִיָּהוּ and Kue.'s interesting but untenable suggestion that יואל was a pseudonymous name formed by inversion of אליהו. 𝔊^{Qa} *ισχυς κῡ παρ Εβραιοις.* 𝔊^{22} *ιωηλ ερμενευεται αγαπητος κῡ ην δε εκ της φυλης ρουβειμ.* Pseudo-Epiphanius, *Vitæ Prophetarum*, says, *ἦν ἐκ τῆς γῆς τοῦ 'Ρουβὴν ἐν ἀγρῷ βεθωμόρων. ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἀπέθανε καὶ ἐτάφη ἐκεῖ* (Marti).—פתואל occurs only here; 𝔊 𝔏 𝔖 read בתואל, which was also the name of Rebeka's father (Gn. 22^{23} $24^{15.\ 24.\ 47}$). 𝔗 𝔙 = 𝔐. פתואל has been variously explained, from the root פתה *to persuade*, which the old Jewish commentators regarded as another form of Samuel who prevailed over God in prayer (1 S. 8^{2}). But בתואל is probably the more orig. reading. The explanation of the Midrash, *Why was his name called* פתואל? *Because he had his hair curled like a virgin* (כבתולה), seems to contain a word-play on בתואל and בתולה and to argue for בתואל as orig. (Rahmer).—**2.** הזקנים, the reading הכהנים in one ms. of de R. and in the marg. of one cod. of Kenn. is an interpretation. כזאת = זאת. בימיכם, 𝔊^{ANY} *ἡμῶν*, 𝔐 is better. ואם usually אם in disjunctive questions, but *cf.* Ges.$^{\S\,150\,g}$. והאזינו *yea, give ear*, the constr. of an imv. with waw conj. after another imv. makes each imv. distinct. Else waw cons. with pf. Siev. om. the waw.—**3.** עליה in emphatic position. Gr. suggests פעליה. ספר is stronger than הגיד; the use of על instead of the simple acc. indicates that particulars and reflections are to be given about it. Now.^{K} om. לבניהם ובניהם prob. for metr. reasons, but it is dub. whether לדור אחר would directly have followed בניכם. *Cf.* Vergil, *Æn.* 3^{98}, *et nati natorum et qui nascentur ab illis;* Homer, *Il.* 20^{308}, *καὶ παίδων παῖδες τοί κεν μετόπισθε γένωνται* (Cred.). Du. transposes הזקנים from v. ^{2} to the beginning of v. ^{3} because of the metre.—**4.** On the locusts see esp. Cred., pp. 261–313, and Dr., pp 82–91, and the literature cited there. גזם *shearer*, 2^{25} Am. 4^{9}, from גזם, *to cut off*. ארבה Assy. *aribu*, usually connected with רבה *to multiply*, = *swarmer*, but this is doubtful. It is the usual name for locust and occurs frequently. ילק is usually connected with לקק *to lick, lap* = *the lapper*, elsewhere Na. $3^{15.16}$ Je. $51^{14.27}$. Hpt. (*JBL.*, XXVI, p. 34) connects it with Assy. *ilkitu*, Ar. *u̯alaqâ*, = *leaper*. חסיל from חסל *to finish*, the vb. is used in Dt. 28^{38} of the action of the locusts. In NH. = *to destroy utterly, to bring to an end.* Taanith $3^{66\,d}$, "Why is the locust called *ḫasîl*? Because it brings everything to an end." Elsewhere חסיל occurs 2^{25} 1 K. 8^{37} (‖ 2 Ch. 6^{28}) Is. 33^{4} Ps. 78^{46}. It is not impossible that ילק may denote a certain stage in the development of the locust but its use in Na. 3^{16} Je. 51^{27} does not favour the non-winged state. The various stages are summarised by Dr. as follows, "The insect, after leaving the egg, casts its skin not less than six times before it assumes its complete form (which is reached 6–7 weeks from birth), but only three of the stages through which it thus passes are clearly different to an ordinary observer. Immediately after the locusts are hatched, they are in the *larva*-stage, in which they have no wings, but are capable of hopping about; and advancing in compact bodies, they begin almost immediately their destructive operations. After about three weeks' time, their fourth moult brings them to the *pupa*-stage, in which their wings are partially developed, but enclosed as yet in membranous cases; in this stage they advance by walking rather than by hopping. Ten days after reaching the pupa-stage, they moult again; and 10–15 days after this, by a last moult, they disengage themselves from their 'pupa,' or nymph-skin, and as soon as their wings are stiffened and dry, mount in clouds into the air; they are now the *imago*, or complete insect. In all stages of their development, they are equally voracious, and equally destructive to vegetation," pp. 84 *f.* Cred. thought that the four names denoted different stages of development. But the order in 2^{25} is diff., and ארבה, the most common term for locust, would then not denote the complete insect. Moreover, the swarms move onward and it could therefore not be said, *what the shearer had left, the swarmer has eaten*, because the shearer had become the swarmer and was no longer in the place where it was first. *Cf.* Dr., p. 37 n.

POETIC PICTURE OF THE DISTRESS OF THE WINE-DRINKERS (1^{5-7}).

[5] Awake, ye (merry) tipplers and weep,
and wail, all ye bibbers of wine,
Because of the must, for 'tis snatched from your mouth!

[6] For a nation has invaded my land,
powerful and numberless;
Its teeth are the teeth of a lion,
and it has a lioness' jaw-teeth.

[7] It has turned my vines to waste,
and my fig trees to splinters,
Has stripped them clean bare and thrown down (the shreds),
white gleam their branches.

Three strs., (1) v. [5] a hexameter + a trimeter, strs. 2 and 3 are formed by two pentameters each.

5–7. Joel was a poet. He could not be satisfied with a mere prosaic statement of the calamity. With dramatic power he calls on the various classes of the people to lament over the awful catastrophe.—**5.** He addresses the wine-bibbers and rouses them from their sleep of intoxication that they may mourn with all the lovers of wine over the destruction of the grape-vines and the loss of the grape-juice, which the locusts have snatched, as it were, from their very lips. In contrast to their usual merriment they are to wail in desperate grief, for they will no longer be able to indulge in their precious and beloved sweet wine. It may be that the loss of the wine is mentioned first because the locusts had come immediately before the vintage, but this may be due to Joel's rhetoric.—**6.** The reason why the sweet wine is taken away from the wine-bibbers is a severe locust plague. The locusts are compared to an invading nation of huge numbers and terribly armed. For this comparison see also 2^{4-9}, Pr. 30^{25-27}. Homer also speaks of peoples of bees, of flies, etc. The invading army is strong and powerful, and irresistible in its attack. Joel does not think here of the strength of the individual locust, for though they are quite strong it is only their immense numbers that make them so formidable. *Without number* is literally true; *cf.* Je. 46^{23}.

"You feel as if never before you had realised immensity in number. Vast crowds of men gathered at a festival, countless tree-tops rising along the slope of a forest ridge, the chimneys of London houses from the top of St. Paul's—all are as nothing to the myriads of insects that blot out the sun above and cover the ground beneath and fill the air whichever way one looks."—Jas. Bryce, *Impressions of South Africa*, 1897 (quoted by GASm., p. 400). "In 1889 there passed over the Red Sea a swarm which was estimated to extend over 2,000 square miles, and each locust being assumed to weigh $\frac{1}{16}$ oz., the weight of the swarm was calculated to be 42,850 millions of tons; a second and even larger swarm passed on the following day. That these numbers are no exaggeration is shown by the Government Reports on the destruction of the locusts in Cyprus. In 1881 over 1,300 tons of locust eggs had been destroyed, but in spite of this it was calculated that over 5,000 egg cases, each containing many eggs, were deposited in the island in 1883."—*EB.*, III, col. 2808, *s. v.* Locust.

The weapons of this army of locusts are their strong jaw-teeth whose destructive power is brought out by comparing them to those of lions. "Their mandibles and maxillæ are strong, sharp and jagged."—*Cent. Dict.*, *s. v.* locust. ". . . to strength incredible for so small a creature, they add saw-like teeth, admirably calculated to eat up all the herbs of the land."—Morier, *A Second Journey Through Persia*, p. 99 (Pu.). Pliny reports that they even gnaw through doors (*Hist. Nat.*, I, 11, ch. 12).—It is not certain whether the prophet means by *my land* his own or Yahweh's land. Of course, Judah is referred to in either case. The use of *my vine* and *my fig tree* in v. [7] would seem to indicate that Joel was speaking in Yahweh's name and that *my land* is Yahweh's land; but see on the other hand vv. [9. 13] where Yahweh is spoken of in the 3d pers.—**7.** Since Joel is speaking here of the ruin of the vintage he does not refer to the plants and vegetables which the locusts attack, as a rule, first, but of the total destruction of the vines and fig trees. For the personal pronoun see v. [6]. *He has reduced my vines* (Heb. sg. coll.) *to a waste—and my fig trees to splinters! He has utterly stripped them* of their leaves and bark and while he was devouring he *has thrown* the shreds and twigs to the ground, and stripped off their bark so that *their branches gleam white.*

This is an exact description, verified by many travellers. "When they have devoured all other vegetables, they attack the trees, consuming first the leaves then the bark."—Jackson, *Travels to Morocco.* "After having consumed herbage, fruit, leaves of trees, they attacked even their young shoots and their bark."—Adansson, *Voyage au Sénégal*, p. 88. "It is sufficient, if these terrible columns stop half an hour on a spot, for everything growing on it, vines, olive trees, and corn, to be entirely destroyed. After they have passed nothing remains but the large branches and the roots, which being underground have escaped their voracity."—*Constitutional*, May, 1841, of locusts in Spain in that year. "They are particularly injurious to the palm trees; these they strip of every leaf and green particle, the trees remaining like skeletons with bare branches."—Burckhardt, *Notes*, II, p. 90. "The country did not seem to be burnt, but to be covered with snow, through the whiteness of the trees, and the dryness of the herbs."—Fr. Alvarez, *l. c.*, ch. 33 (all quoted by Pu.). "The gardens outside Jaffa are now completely stripped, even the bark of the young trees having been devoured, and look like a birch-tree forest in winter."—*Journ. Sacr. Lit.*, Oct., 1865 (Dr.).

5. הקיצו, *cf.* Gn. 9²⁴ Pr. 23³⁵. 𝔊 adds the explanatory *ἐξ οἴνου αὐτῶν*, which Du. accepts as orig. but with sf. of 2d pers. pl.—שכורים vocative, without art. contrary to the rule, Ges. § ¹²⁶ ᵉ. Van H. concludes that all inhabitants and not only a fraction are addressed.—In והיללו Siev. om. waw conj., with 𝔊, and places הילילו after יין.—עסיס *sweet wine*, √ עסס *to press out, grape juice as pressed out. Cf.* 𝔊 in Jo. 4¹⁸ *γλυκασμός*, in Is. 49²⁶ *οἶνος νέος.* In distinction from יין which is fermented wine עסיס is either must or wine made by a process in which fermentation was artificially arrested (Am. 9¹³ Is. 49²⁶ Ct. 8²). See Dr., on Am. 9¹³.—𝔊 adds *εὐφροσύνη καὶ χαρά* = שִׂמְחָה וָגִיל; *cf.* 1¹⁶.—נכרת, vv. ⁵· ⁹· ¹⁶ = נמנע, v. ¹³.—**6.** עלה על military term for invading.—מתלעות *jaw-teeth;* 𝔊 *μύλαι*, always parall. with שנים, Pr. 30¹⁴ Jb. 29¹⁷ ψ 58⁷ (מלתעות for מתלעות).—לביא, 𝔊 Σ 𝔙 כַּלָּבִיא. Siev., Marti וּמתלעותָיו כַּלָּבִיא; 𝔐 is preferable.—**7.** שם לשמה, word-play.—קצפה is parall. to שמה, 𝔊 *συγκλασμόν.* BDB. cp. Ar. *ḳaṣafa, break, snap off, a snapping* or *splintering*, Dr. *splinters.* קצף is also connected with קטף, *pluck off* (twigs, etc.); *cf.* השליך v. ᵇ. Gr. reads לקטפה, but this is perhaps not necessary since קצפה = קטפה. This holds good also for קֶצֶף (Ho. 10⁷) הִשְׁלִכָה כְּקֶצֶף על פני מים, *cast* (sic!) *like a chip upon the water.*—והשליך has no sf., it may have been om. intentionally, *cf.* ψ 139¹, or we must read with We., Now. וַיַּחְשְׂפָה חָשֹׂף וְהִשְׁלִךְ *he has stripped it, stripping and throwing away, i. e.* he stripped the bark of the fig trees and of the grape-vines—for they are both included in the sf.—and in doing so shreds of leaf and bark fell to the ground. השליך, *cf.* Je. 9¹⁸ Jb. 18⁷.—והלבינו Hiph. *show whiteness, grow white, cf.* Ges. § ⁵³ ᵈ. One cod. of de R., 𝔖, Ar. have sg., *he makes its branches white.* 𝔐 is better. The sg. in 𝔊 is due to pl. neuter of the subj.—𝔊 confuses חשף with חפש, *ἐξερευνῶν ἐξηρεύνησεν αὐτήν.*—שריג is the branch of the vine also in Gn. 40$^{10.\ 12}$. Etymologically it means *something intertwined, tendril, twig*, so that it may denote the young branches of the fig tree also.

THE DISTRESS OF THE PRIESTS (1$^{8-10}$).

[8] With a sorrow like that of a virgin, sack-girt
for the spouse of her youth,
[9b] Sorrow the priests,
the ministers of Yahweh,
[9a] For the meal-offering and the libation are cut off
from the temple of Yahweh.

[10] The fields are blasted,
the ground is mourning,
For the corn is blasted,
the new wine is abashed
The fresh oil pines away.

Two strs., (1) vv. [8. 9] a pentameter + a tetrameter + a pentameter, (2) v. [10] a tetrameter + a hexameter consisting of three dimeters (staccato style).

8–10. Joel turns now to the priests. A dramatic division into a chorus of revellers and a chorus of priests is not intended. It is simply the rapid turning from one class to another.—**8.** *With a sorrow like that of a virgin who is girded with sackcloth for the husband of her youth, sorrow the priests, the ministers of Yahweh.* This is most probably the orig. reading, for the rendering *lament like a virgin!* is beset by various difficulties. The fem. form of the imv. would show that either the land or the community was addressed. But the address is omitted, which is so awkward that some insert *my land*, or *daughter of my people*, or *Israel*. It is, however, not the people who mourn so, but the priests, as v. [13] shows, though there the line is probably inserted. There were two comparisons for the deepest sorrow, the mourning for an only son, *cf.* Am. 8^{10}, and the heart-rending sorrow of the young virgin for her betrothed, *the husband of her youth*, with whom she had not yet tasted the joy of married life. To the Hebrews a betrothal was as binding as marriage, and the engaged were subject to the same laws as the married people and were punished in case of transgression in the same manner. A betrothed maiden could therefore be called *the wife of his neighbour* (Dt. 22$^{23\,\mathrm{f.}}$), and the man *the husband of* *her youth.* For his death she mourns, clothes herself in sackcloth, the common mourning apparel, and laments.—**9.** So the priests mourn because the most awful thing that could happen has come about; the daily sacrifices have ceased, for there is no material for offerings! The necessary means of communion with Yahweh are taken away, "the tokens of Jehovah's presence and favour, manifested in His acceptance of the offerings have been removed" (Dav.). That the daily sacrifices are meant here admits of no doubt. On the *meal-offering*, *cf.* Lev. 2, on the *libation* or drink-offering, usually in connection with a burnt-offering, *cf.* Ex. 29^{38-42} Nu. 28^{3-8}. The postexilic community laid great stress on the daily offerings believing that by means of them daily contact and intercourse with Yahweh were assured; *cf.* Ne. 10^{33}. How terrible a misfortune the cessation of the daily sacrifices was considered is plain from Dn. 8^{11} 11^{31} 12^{11} and esp. from Josephus who tells us that they were not omitted even in times of siege and that their cessation on July 17th, 70 A.D., during the siege of Titus produced an awful impression (*Bell. Jud.*, VI, 2, 1). And this calamity, we are told, had befallen the people in Joel's day. The impression on Joel is very profound, it shows how different his attitude toward the cult was from that of the pre-exilic prophets. He valued sacrifices highly, they rejected them; *cf.* Am. 5^{25} Ho. 4^{6} 8^{11} Is. 1^{12} Je. 7^{21}. To Joel they were a condition of the gracious intercourse between Yahweh and his people, to the pre-exilic prophets it was impossible to find Yahweh by means of them. There is only one sanctuary referred to by Joel, one *house of Yahweh*, at Jerusalem where *the ministers of the altar* perform their sacred functions. That this side of the calamity would be most keenly felt by them is natural, for it touched them first of all.—**10.** "The longer lines into which Hebrew parallelism tends to run are replaced by a rapid series of short, heavy phrases, falling like blows. . . . Joel loads his clauses with the most leaden letters he can find, and drops them in quick succession, repeating the same heavy word again and again, as if he would stun the careless people into some sense of the bare, brutal weight of the calamity which has befallen them" (GASm., p. 405). *The field is blasted, the ground mourns*, a beautiful personification; *cf.* Am. 1^{2}. When crops are abundant "the vales shout for joy and sing" (Ps. 65[13]). Here the ground mourns *because the corn is blasted, the new wine is ashamed*, another personification, *cf.* Is. 24[7], = *has failed, the oil languishes*, elsewhere this word is used of fading, withering trees; *cf. e. g.* v. [12]. Corn, wine and oil were the most important products of the land, and are often mentioned together; *e. g.*, Dt. 7[13] 9[14] 28[51] Ho. 2[8]. The words denote both the corn in the ears, the juice in the grapes and in the olives, and the prepared products. Here the former appear to be meant. The word-plays of the Heb. cannot be reproduced in English.

THE DISTRESS OF THE HUSBANDMEN AND OF THE VINE DRESSERS (1[11. 12]).

11. Abashed are the husbandmen,
the vineyard keepers wail,
For the wheat and the barley,—
for the harvest of the field has perished.

12. The vine is abashed,
and the fig tree is drooping,
Pomegranate as well as palm
and apple are dried up.

Yea, joy is abashed (and has gone)
away from the children of men.

In v. [12] there is added, *all the trees of the field*.—We have here five tetrameters (staccato style), they may form either three strs., as here printed, or two, v. [12] consisting only of one str. Possibly the whole section is but one str.

11–12. The third class which Joel mentions are the cultivators of the soil, the husbandmen and vineyard keepers who mourn and lament with all the outward signs of grief over the loss of their harvests.—**11.** The prophet need not exhort them by an imperative call to be disappointed, he describes their grief and consternation. The reason for the sorrow of the husbandmen is given in v. [11b], *for the wheat and the barley*, here mentioned for all the products of the field, *for the harvest of the field has perished*. The reason for the lament of the vineyard keepers is given in v. [12], which shows that the term embraces not only vineyard keepers or planters but fruit-growers in general.—**12.** He speaks of *the vine* as *showing signs of shame*, as the husbandmen did in v. [11]. *And the fig tree* *languishes, the pomegranate as well as the palm and the apple tree are dried up.* Probably *all the trees of the field* is an addition. But whether it is or not we need not be surprised by the omission of the olive tree, for the passage is not prose but poetry. If it were not for 1$^{17-20}$ we should regard the drying up of the trees as due to the locust plague, and this would be quite possible, but there we are told of a long drought from which the land was suffering at the same time. *Yea,* Joel concludes his description by the beautiful line, *joy is ashamed (and has gone) away from the children of men.* Joy is personified, she hides herself in shame not daring to let her face be seen. The harvest joy has vanished. The land is full of sorrow. How can gladness dwell with men who are so full of grief?

8. אלי only here in OT., אלה usual in Aram. One ms. reads אֶבְלִי, Houb. הֵילִלִי. 𝔊 *θρήνησον πρὸς μέ* = אֱלִי בְּכִי , בכי is prob. due to dittog. of the foll. 'כב. Note also *ὑπὲρ νύμφην* = כבתולה (?). As subj. of אלי 𝔗 supplies ישראל, de W., Marti אַרְצִי, Hi. בַּת עַמִּי, Siev. substitutes יִשְׂרָאֵל for אֱלִי. Du. reads pl. for sg., but it is not the topers that appear to be addressed. Ehr. connects אלי with preceding *its branches have become gray for me like a virgin, etc.* More likely אלי was orig. אֵבֶל acc. cog. to אבלו, *with a sorrow like that of a virgin who is girded with sackcloth for the husband of her youth sorrow the priests.* It was changed to אלי after v. ^{9b} had been accidentally displaced, it should follow directly v. ^{8}. כי should be inserted before הכרת, *cf.* the variant reading in v. ^{13b}. The punctuation אֱלִי is somewhat unusual, but *cf.* ψ 147^{7} Nu. 21^{17} עֱנוּ, Ges. § 63 l.—חגורת שק, cstr. expressing girded *with* sackcloth as לְבוּשׁ הַבַּדִּים (Ez. 9^{11}).—**9.** משרתי יהוה 𝔊 משרתי מִזְבֵּחַ, *cf.* v. ^{13}. שרת is often used of the sacred services of the priests from the time of Deuteronomy on. Since the context refers to cultic actions מִזְבֵּחַ may seem the more proper reading, so Me., Now., Marti, *et al.* But see 1$^{13\,a\beta}$ and 2^{17}.—V. ^{9b} is om. by 𝔊^{153}.—אָבְלוּ, 𝔊 *πενθεῖτε* imv., Siev. אִבְלוּ. 𝔐 is preferable. The topers had to be aroused to a realisation of the calamity, the priests and husbandmen (v. ^{11}) know it and are in distress over it. The comparison with the sorrow of the virgin shows that a description is intended.—𝔖 adds מלכים *kings,* feeling that they should not be omitted.—מבית יהוה, Du. adds אֱלֹהֵינוּ mtr. cs.—v. ^{9a} and v. ^{9b} are to be transposed, for v. ^{9b} belongs directly after v. ^{8}.

10. 𝔊 begins with כִּי.—שדד שדה , אבלה ארמה , הוביש תירוש, word-plays.—אָבְלָה, 𝔊 *πενθείτω* imv.—שדה indefinite, in contrast to city, *fields.*—ארמה *cultivated ground.*—Du. inserts before שדד דגן, "*fort ist das Grün,*" mtr. cs.—הוביש is used in ch. 1 (a) of new wine v. ^{10}, of vines v. ^{12}, of corn v. ^{17}; (b) of husbandmen v. ^{11}; (c) of the joy of men v. ^{12}. It is evident that in (b) it must be from בויש and this is the more natural and appropriate meaning also of (c). One might be inclined to connect (a) rather with יבִש, Hiph. *to exhibit dryness, be dried up*, as in Zc. 10^{11}, so the Vrss., Ew., Ges., Or., and one might then think of an interesting play on words. But Joel uses יבש *Qal* to express *to be dried*, vv. $^{12.\ 20}$, so that it is better to take all forms from בוש. They are either metaplastic forms or from a secondary form of בוש, *sc.* יבֹש, *cf.* קוץ and יקץ; טוב and יטב; חול and יחל; *cf.* BDB., *s. v.* יבש. Used of men it means *to be ashamed, confused, disappointed;* of things *to fail, miscarry* (to suffer shame = to be brought to naught).—**11.** הובישו and הילילו either imv., 𝔗, Jewish interpreters, *show shame! show your disappointment! lament!* or pf., 𝔖 𝔙 *they are disappointed and show their disappointment* by outward signs, *they lament*. The latter is preferable, as in v. ^{9} אָבְלוּ. The absence of the art. also favours it, though *cf.* v. ^{5}. 𝔊 *ἐξηράνθησαν* pf., *θρηνεῖτε* imv. One cod. (Kenn.) has בושו for הובישו.—כרמים, Gr., Now. קֹצְרִים harvesters, not Now.^{K}.—קציר is here the barley and wheat harvest not the vintage 𝔊, but *cf.* 4^{13}.—אכרים, 𝔊 *κτήματα*, 𝔖$^{H\ marg.}$, so also Ho. 2^{17} Pr. 31^{16}, Σ *κτήτορες*.—**12.** גם = ו. Marti om. כל עצי השדה as an insertion from 1^{19}. The metre may also be urged as an argument against its originality. 𝔊 adds *καί*. Siev. om. רמון גם תמר ותפוח. We. says "the pomegranate, the palm and the apple would not have been enumerated in an older age." This may be true but רמון occurs as early as 1 S. 14^2; תמר, Ex. 15^{27} (J); עיר התמרים, Ju. 1^{16} (J), Dt. 34^3 (JE)., as a proper name 2 S. 13, etc. Since palm trees suffer especially from locusts, *cf.* on v. ^{7}, even an earlier writer would probably have included them in his list. תפוח occurs only in late books, Pr. 25^{11} Ct. $2^{3.\ 5}$ 7^9 8^5, but its non-occurrence in earlier literature may be accidental, *cf.* Holzinger.—כִּי asseverative, *yea.*—כי הוביש' 𝔊 *ὅτι ᾔσχυναν χαρὰν οἱ υἱοὶ ἀνθρώπων*, due to the omission of כֵּן by haplo.

CALL FOR A PENITENTIAL ASSEMBLY ($1^{13.\ 14}$).

13. Gird yourselves (with sackcloth) and beat the breast, O priests!
wail, ye ministers of the altar!
Come, keep on your sackcloth day and night,
ye ministers of God!
[*For withheld from the house of your God*
are the meal-offering and the libation.]

14. Sanctify a fast!
call a solemn assembly!
Gather all inhabitants of the land
into the house of your God,
And cry unto Yahweh!

Two strs., (1) v. ^{13} a hexameter + a pentameter, v. ^{13c} is a doublet of v. ^{9a}, (2) a tetrameter + a hexameter, consisting of three dimeters (staccato movement). *Cf.* v. ^{10}.

13–14. Joel proceeds to suggest the remedy. He summons the priests not only to mourn and do penance themselves but to proclaim a universal fast, to call all people together to the temple, in order that they may there cry all together to Yahweh. By such earnest national humiliation and penitence Yahweh may be moved to help them.—**13.** *Gird yourselves* (with sackcloth, *cf.* v. $^{8. \, 13b}$ Is. 32^{11}) *and beat your breasts, O ye priests! Wail, ye ministers of the altar! Come* (into the temple, *cf.* 2 S. 12^{16}), *keep on your sackcloth day and night, ye ministers of God!* This accentuates the seriousness of the mourning and penitence. Only in time of dire distress and hard penance the sackcloth was kept on day and night, *cf.* 2 S. 12^{16} 1 K. 21^{27}. The tokens of mourning are not to be removed until the suffering is over. The foll. clause, *for the meal-offering and the libation are withheld from the house of your God*, appears to be a doublet of v. ^{9a} and not original here. In v. ^{9} it is in place, but not here, because Joel has moved on to suggest the remedy. He wants the priests to prepare for a day of public fasting and prayer.—**14.** *Sanctify a fast*, make the necessary preparations. The fast with its abstention from food and ordinary enjoyments was a religious function. Its self-inflicted suffering was intended to propitiate the deity, who seeing the earnestness of the suppliant was supposed to accede more readily to his requests. The underlying idea of fasting and mourning and of putting on of sackcloth is expressed very clearly by David, 2 S. 12^{22}, and by Jon. 3^{7-9}, *cf.* also Jo. 2^{12-14}. *Call a solemn assembly*, *cf.* Am. 5^{21} Is. 1^{13}, *gather all the inhabitants of the country*, *cf.* 2^{16}, *into the house of your God and cry to Yahweh!* The calling together of all adds to the power and effectiveness of the appeal, for when all unite in penitent, sorrowful supplication God will more readily answer. The *old men* or *elders* (official title) have probably been inserted here from 2^{16}. Why they should here be singled out is not clear; it is different in 1^{2} and 2^{16}. Some Vrss. bring out the intensity of their prayer by adding *incessantly* or *with might*.

13. חגרו *sc.* שַׂק, one cod. of de R., one cod. of Kenn. and 𝔖 insert שַׂק.—ספד is used esp. of solemn lamentations, Je. 4^{8} Zc. 8^{5} 12^{10}, for the dead, Gn. 23^{2} 1 K. 14^{13} Je. 22^{18} Zc. 12^{10}, *cf.* van H.—הילילו Siev. om.—באו 𝔊^{153} om. Acc. to van H. באו׳ appears to refer to a ritual usage which was to be observed in the temple. Ehr. translates באו *go home!*—בַּשַּׂקִּים with art. = in your sackclothes.—אלהי 𝔊 𝔏 correctly אלהים, the error in 𝔐 arose from an abbreviation. Siev. reads אֱלֹהֵין = אֱלֹהֵינוּ. There is no reason for a distinction between *my God* and *your God*. V. ^{13b} is a variant of v. ^{9a} and not orig. here. So also Du.—**14.** קדש is a denominative verb, *to consecrate with religious rites*, a fast, 1^{14} 2^{15}, an assembly, 2^{16} (*cf.* 2 K. 10^{20}), war, 4^{9} (*cf.* Je. 6^{4} Mi. 3^{5}). Sometimes קרא is equivalent to קדש, *e. g.*, Jo. 1^{14} קראו עצרה = קדשו עצרה, 2 K. 10^{20}. זקנים om. with We., Marti, Du., else read וְכל ישבי׳. We. reads הֵאָסְפוּ *gather yourselves!* 𝔐 is preferable. בית יהוה אלהיכם 𝔊 om. יהוה, metre also favours this. At the end 𝔊 adds ἐκτενῶς 𝔙 *vehementer*, in order to bring out the full force of וזעקו. Jon. 3^{8} בְּחָזְקָה is thus translated by 𝔊.

INSERTION CONCERNING THE DAY OF YAHWEH (1^{15}).

15. "*Alas for the day!—*
For at hand is the day of Yahweh,
and as destruction from the All-destroyer it comes!"

A dimeter + a hexameter.

15 does not belong to the original text of Joel but is the first interpolation of the day of Yahweh; see p. 50. The interpolator connects the locust plague with the day of Yahweh and explains it as its forerunner. To him it is not the present calamity which is to be feared, however great it may be, but the more awful day whose harbingers the locusts seem to be. He does not think that the day has already arrived but that it is imminent, and to him it is the dread of this impending catastrophe that necessitates the appeal to Yahweh, not the locust plague. This is entirely different from Joel's own view of the situation. The idea of the day is in line with that proclaimed by Amos (5$^{18-20}$) as a day of punishment. Only that with the pre-exilic prophets the presentiment of its approach was awakened as a rule by some great political movement, while here the locust plague is interpreted as heralding its coming. *Alas for the day! For the day of Yahweh is near, and as destruction from the Almighty*, lit. *an overpowering from the Overpowerer* (Dr.) *it comes!* This cry of alarm is quoted from Is. 13^{6} Ez. 30$^{2.3}$; *cf.* also Zp. 1$^{7.14}$ Ob. ^{15}. The phrase *as an overpowering from the*

Overpowerer appears to be a proverbial phrase and reminds one of *like the overthrow caused by God*, Am. 4^{11}. The force of *as* is rightly interpreted by Dr., "the coming visitation will be what a devastation proceeding from the Almighty might be expected to be, it will realise what the term implies, it will be a veritable 'overpowering from the Overpowerer,'" unless we should have to read both here and in Is. 13^6 *for, because* instead of *as*, which would involve a very slight change in Heb.

15. 𝕾 connects v. ^{15} with v. ^{14} by *and say*, vv. $^{15\,ff.}$ contain thus acc. to 𝕾 the prayer. With v. ^{15a} cp. Ez. $30^{2.\,3}$ הילילו הה ליום כי קרוב יום וקרוב יום ליהוה, with v. ^{15b} cp. Is. 13^6 הילילו כי קרוב יום יהוה כְּשֹׁד מִשַּׁדַּי יָבוא. 𝕲 translates אהה by threefold *οἴμοι* perhaps due to double reading of preceding יהוה *sc.* הה , הא , הו (Rahmer). כשד משדי with forcible assonance. Though שדי and שד are here derived from the same root, this is not decisive for the true etymology of שדי. See Dr., *Additional Note on Chap. I*, 15 (*Shaddai*), p. 81, also his excursus I in his com. on *Genesis*, pp. 404–6. Probably שדי is an ancient Semitic divine name (Marti). Baethgen, *Beiträge zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, pp. 192 *ff.*, 291 *ff.*, connects it with the root שדד; Nö., *ZDMG.*, 1886, pp. 735 *f.*, and Hoffmann, *Phönizische Inschriften*, p. 53, connect it with שֵׁד *demon;* Zim., *KAT*,^{3} p. 358, with *šadû*, a divine title of the Babylonians. 𝕲 translates *ὡς ταλαιπωρία ἐκ ταλαιπωρίας* = כְּשֹׁד יָשֹׁד, due to haplo. of י in כמשדי יבוא. In Is. 13^6 *καὶ συντριβὴ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ* (= שדי).

PRAYER VOICING THE NEED OF ALL CREATURES IN VIEW OF THE FAMINE AND DROUGHT (1^{16-20}).

[16] Is not (our) food cut off
before our very eyes?
From the house of our God
gladness and joy?

[17] Waste lie the store-houses,
ruined the barns!
Since the corn has failed,
[18] what shall we put in them?

Aimlessly the herds of cattle wander about,
because they have no pasture,
And even the flocks of sheep stand aghast,
[19] unto thee, O Yahweh, they cry.

For fire has devoured
  the pastures of the steppe,
And the flame has scorched
  all the trees of the field.

Even the wild beasts
  cry aloud to Thee,
For the water-courses are dried up
[*And fire has devoured*
  the pastures of the steppe.]

Five strs., strs. 1, 2, 4 consist of two tetrameters each, str. 3 of two hexameters, str. 5 of a tetrameter + a trimeter.

16–20. These verses may be taken either as a renewed description of the distress of man and beast or as the substance of the prayer which the people are to present to Yahweh. The direct address in vv. [19. 20] appears to decide for the latter interpretation. It is true that vv. [16–18] do not sound like a prayer. Notice the difference in 2^{17}! But there is something moving in the simple recital of the desperate situation of the people and deeply appealing in the awful distress of the animals which cry to Yahweh for relief in their anguish. Even so it is not a complete prayer. Perhaps the interpolated v. [15] has taken the place of an original, brief passionate appeal.—**16.** A fresh description of the calamity begins here in any case. *Is not food cut off before our very eyes?* We must look on without being able to prevent it. Cp. for the force of the phrase *before our eyes*, Is. 1^7 Dt. 28^{31} Ps. 23^5. It stands here in an emphatic position, laying stress on the helplessness of the onlookers. The *food* Joel has in mind esp. is that destined for the altar which was eaten in conformity to the ritual, at the great harvest festivals when gratitude and joy filled every heart. But now there are no harvest feasts, not even the daily sacrifices; cut off *from the house of our God* are *joy and gladness.* The element of joy was not missing in the temple worship in postexilic times, as some have thought. Cp., *e. g.*, the jubilant psalms of praise of the postexilic community. —**17.** There being no harvests *the store-houses are dilapidated, the barns are broken down.* We do not know any particulars about the store-houses and barns of the ancient Jews, but evidently they were not solidly built and had to be repaired every year. This year there was no use for them. *Since the corn has failed* (lit. *shows shame*) *what shall we put in them?* The first half of v. [17], translated by AV., *The seed* (marg.: *grains*) *is rotten under their clods*, by RV., *The seeds rot* (marg.: *shrivel*) *under their clods*, is in all probability nothing more than a corrupt variant of the following sentence. The first clause of v. [18] belongs with v. [17], for the reading, *how the beasts groan!* is due to a wrong vocalisation of the text. 𝔊 has preserved the right text, *what shall we put in them?*

18–20. The distress of the cattle, of the sheep and of the wild animals is vividly described.—**18.** *Aimlessly the herds of cattle wander about*, perplexed where to find food, *because they have no pasture.* And *even the flocks of sheep*, which prefer the dry pastures of the steppe and which do not suffer as quickly as the cattle which need rich, moist pastures, even they *stand aghast*, perishing with hunger.—**19.** *Unto Thee, O Yahweh, they cry*, appealing for help. Underlying is the idea that Yahweh cannot resist this universal cry that goes up to Him from man and beast. It is not the prophet who cries to Yahweh (𝔐) either because moved thereto by the distress of the animals or in the name of the community, but the animals themselves, as v. [20] clearly shows, *cf.* also Jon. $3^{7.\ 8}$. They cry *because the fire has devoured the pastures of the steppe, and the flame has burnt all the trees of the field.* The fire and flame are most probably the scorching heat of the sun, *cf.* Am. 7^4, and signify an accompanying drought. We might regard them as figuratively describing the devastation caused by the locusts, *cf.* 2^3, if it were not for v. [20b], where the drying up of the rivers shows that the destruction of all vegetation is not merely due to the visitation of the locusts but also to a severe drought. It has often been noticed that locusts are worst in very hot summers.* The word translated by AV., RV., *wilderness*, means really *the steppe* where the cattle and sheep are driven to pasture.—**20.** *Even the wild animals cry aloud to Thee, for the channels of water are dried up*, and they do not know how to quench their thirst. If the last clause is not simply a doublet of v. ^{19ba}, which is most likely, it is a kind of refrain, dolefully reiterating, *and the fire has devoured the pastures of the steppe.*

---

* "*Siccate gaudent locustæ*," says Tertullian, *De anima*, ch. 32; "*sicco vere major proventus*," observes Pliny, *Hist. Nat.*, XI, 29. "This year was remembered for the locust swarms and great summer heat," Doughty, *Arabia Deserta*, p. 335. GASm. thinks that the clause *the flame has burnt all the trees of the field* is best explained by forest fires, which are so often a consequence of an absolute drought.

16. In עינינו and אלהינו 𝔊 has sf. 2d pers. pl. Acc. to this v. ^{16} would be an appeal to the priests, not part of a prayer.—**17.** The second half is clear, only read מְגֻרוֹת for ממגרות, the מ is due to dittog., *cf.* Hg. 2^{19}, Aq. *εκ θησαυρων*, as if מִמ׳. It is parall. to אצרות, and thus = *storehouses, granaries.* The first half is very difficult. Of the four words three are ἁπ. To get at their meaning scholars have gone back to their roots and compared them with the cognate languages. עבשׁ has been compared with Ar. *ʿabisa, to contract* (esp. the face), *to frown*, and the meaning *shrivel* has thus been derived for our passage, so among others RVm., Buhl, BDB. Others have explained it from NH., Aram. עְפַשׁ, *to rot*, 𝔙, AE., Ki., AV., RV. But this is suitable only if animals are referred to, since rotting of vegetable matter is not an effect of severe and continued heat. 𝔙 takes it of beasts of burden that rot in their dung, *computruerunt jumenta in stercore suo.* But this involves translations for כרדות and מגרפת which are not certain. פרדות is usually derived from √ פרד, *to divide*, *separate*, and compared with Syr. *ferda'*, *ferada'*, *kernel*, *berry*, and the Jew. Aram. פְּרִידָא *pebble*, *berry*, and then translated *grains of seed*, Buhl, BDB., *seeds*, AV., RV. If this is correct, the transl. of AV., RV. *the seeds rot* is impossible, *shrivel* would be suitable. 𝔙 pointed פְּרָדוֹת *jumenta* (*v. i.*). מגרפתיהם comes from √ גרף *to sweep away*, so also NH., Ar., Aram., and is translated either *clods*, AE., Ki., AV., RV. or *shovels*, BDB., *et al.* The transl. *clods* would make sense but it is etymologically indefensible, since both the root and the noun in Heb., NH., Aram., Ar, mean *to sweep away*, and the instrument with which this is done, *shovel*, *hoe* or *broom*, *besom*, *cf.* NH. מַגְרֵפָה, Aram. *magrafta'*, Ar. *miǵrafatun.* "The Ar. *gurf* does not mean *gleba terræ* (Ke.), but (Lane, *Arab. Lex.*, p. 411), *the water-worn bank of a stream. Clod* (Heb. רגב, Jb. XXI, 33, XXXVIII, 38) would not be a probable generalisation even of a word signifying properly, *masses of earth swept away by a stream*" (Dr.) or of a word denoting the overhanging edge of the border of a stream or hollow road. The transl. *shovels* (*hoes*), though etymologically correct, makes no sense: *the grains of seed shrivel under their shovels!* Stei. emends, therefore, מגרפהיהם by רִגְבֵיהֶם *their clods*, *cf.* Jb. 21^{33} 38^{38}, and translates *the seeds shrivel under their clods.* If the text is to be emended at all this is the best emendation, but *v. i.* None of the Vrss. knew the meaning of this line. On the basis of 𝔊$^{B\aleph AQ}$ *ἐσκίρτησαν δαμάλεις ἐπὶ ταῖς φάτναις αὐτῶν*, Merx emended פָּשׁוּ פָּרוֹת הַחַת (?) אֻרְוֹתֵיהֶם. But it is difficult to account for החת and for the change of מגרפתיהם to ארותיהם. Besides פשו is hardly the word Me. wants, for it does not express the distress of the animals before the (empty?) mangers. Elsewhere the vb. is used of gambolling or proud prancing.

Moreover, the animals are not dealt with till v. ^{18}, their mention here is premature. This tells also against 𝔐. Marti tries to meet these objections by reading הוֹבִישׁוּ פְּרָדִים (פְּרָדוֹת) עַל אֻרְוֹתֵיהֶם *the mules stand disappointed by their mangers*, and by transposing this to the beginning of v. ^{18}. But the difficulty of תחת מג remains. It is easier to believe that 𝔊 translated תחת freely by *ἐπὶ* than to explain how על was changed to תחת. Now.^{K} reconstructs the text of 𝔊 עָֽכְס(שׁ)וּ פָּרוֹת תַּחַת רִפְתֵיהֶם and adopts this with the single change of פְּרָדוֹת or פְּרָדִים for פרות. But while graphically easier, this text is also improbable. Van H. reads פּוּרִית for פרדות and translates, *les 'pressoirs' se sont encrassés sous leur immondices*. But is it true that the wine-presses *rot* or *become mouldy*—this is the meaning of עפש which van H. compares, not simply *become soiled!*—during a season of protracted drought?—From this survey it is clear that the text of v. ^{17a} is corrupt, and meaningless as it stands. But the matter is not hopeless because an old scribe or editor had noticed it also and had put directly after it the correct text, perhaps from a better ms. The old text, which in places had become illegible and which had therefore been so badly copied, he left also, just as the scribe in Ho. 9^{13} wrote down a text which he could not quite make out, as he himself tells us כאשר ראיתי *as I see*, so the scribe in Jo. 1^{17} wrote down the text as he could make it out, without, however, adding כאשר ראיתי. And just as in Ho. 9^{13} another scribe wrote directly after the corrupt line, אפרים לצור שתולה בנוה the correct text אפרים להוציא אל הרג בניו, so here also עבשו פרדות תחת מגרפתיהם is followed by the correct reading נשמו אצרות נהרסו מגרות. *Cf.* Bewer, *JBL.*, 1911, p. 61 *f.* V. ^{17a} must therefore not be corrected but omitted, v. ^{17b} contains the correction.—מגרות 𝔊 *ληνοὶ* (Aq., Σ, Θ, *θησαυροὶ*) Me. regards this as original = גִּתּוֹת, but מגרות is preferable.

18. 𝔐 מה נאנחה בהמה *how the beasts groan!* With different vocalisation 𝔊 reads *τί ἀποθήσομεν ἑαυτοῖς* = מָה נַּנִּיחָה בָּהֵנָּה *what shall we put in them? i. e.*, in the store-houses, since the corn has failed. This gives a very satisfactory conclusion to v. ^{17} and is most likely the correct reading, so Me., We., *et al.* א was sometimes written, sometimes not, here it was wrongly written by a scribe who thought it was נֶאֶנְחָה. But this never occurs elsewhere with animals, and though it cannot be regarded as an impossible reading, 𝔊 is more probable. כִּי = *since.*—נָבֹכוּ Ni. from בוּךְ, *cf.* Ex. 14^{3} where Israel wanders aimlessly about, here it is the cattle that do not know where to find pasture. 𝔊 *ἔκλαυσαν* = בָּכוּ. Me. adopts this, but the *weeping* of animals is grotesque, and occurs nowhere in OT. The translator of the *Dodekapropheton* did not recognise בוך in Mi. 7^{4} either, מְבוּכָתָם *κλαυθμοὶ αὐτῶν.* Ex. 14^{3} Is. 22^{5} Est. 3^{15} are correctly translated by 𝔊. Siev. om. כי אין מרעה להם as a prosaic gloss.—נאשמו Ni. only here, vb. never elsewhere used of animals. If orig. it would mean *suffer punishment* (as a consequence of guilt), Ger-

man: *büssen müssen.* But 𝔊 *ἠφανίσθησαν*, 𝔖 𝔙 *disperierunt* read נָשַׁמּוּ *are made desolate* or *stand aghast* (*cf.* Ho. 5^{15} 𝔐 יאשמו, 𝔊 יָשַׁמּוּ, also Ho. 10^{2} 14^{1}; *cf.* also נאנחה and נבכו above). Though שמם is elsewhere not used of animals, this is evidently the correct reading. So also Me., We., Marti, *et al.* In La. 4^{5} it is used of men who have nothing to eat, here of animals. Its meaning is therefore virtually ≙ *they are famished* or *perish* with hunger and thirst, *cf.* also Ez. 4^{17}. Siev. adds בַּצָּמָא.—**19.** אקרא is not correct, for it is not the prophet but the animals that cry to Yahweh, as the parall. in v. ^{20} shows, *cf.* also Jon. $3^{7.\,8}$. Arm. ms. (HP.) *βοήσονται*, Siev. קָרְאוּ, certainly correct. Du. קְרָא. V. $^{19\beta a}$ = v. $^{20b\beta}$. נְאוֹת pl. cstr. of נָוֶה as usual, נְוֵת Zp. 2^{6}; 𝔙 wrongly *speciosa* as if from נָאוֶה. מדבר without art. also 2^{22}, with art. 1^{20}.—**20.** בהמות though the pl. is not impossible, Ges.$^{\S 145k}$, it is better to read the sg. בְּהֵמַת, or תַּעַרְגוּ for תַּעֲרוֹג, 2^{22} favours the latter.—ערג only here and twice in ψ 42^{1} where it is used of the hind and of the soul. 𝔊 *ἀνέβλεψαν*, Aq. *ἐπρασιώθη*, 𝔙 *quasi area sitiens imbrem suspexerunt*, this is intended as the transl. of ערגו in accordance with Aq.; Jer. explains *hoc enim uno verbo significat Aquila discens, ἐπρασιώθη.* The vb. has usually been connected with עָרַג, from which עֲרוּגָה, *garden terrace* or *bed*, is derived, and it has been compared with the Ar. and Eth. root ערג *to ascend*, and then been explained as = to ascend (with longing and desire) = *to long for*, 𝔊 *ἐπιποθεῖ*, 𝔙 *desiderat* ψ 42^{1}, *to pant*, AV., RV. But it would seem as if this ערג had nothing to do with ערוגה, and the meaning given to it by 𝔖, the Rabbis, Luther, Cal., *et al.*, *to cry* or *cry aloud* is much more fitting both here and in ψ 42^{1}, *cf.* also ψ 104^{21}. Ehr., *Psalmen, ad* 42^{1}, connects it with Ar. *ʿaǵǵa, to cry aloud.*—בהמות שדה *the wild animals*, *cf.* 1 S. 17^{44}, elsewhere חית השדה.—Du. appears to omit אליך, but the parall. in v. ^{19a} argues for its genuineness.—אפיקי מים also ψ 42^{1}, 𝔊 *ἀφέσεις ὑδάτων.* Acc. to Deissmann this was the technical term for irrigation-ditches in Egypt in the Ptolemaic and Roman periods.—V. $^{20b\beta}$ = v. $^{19b\alpha}$, 𝔊$^{95.\,114.\,153.\,185.\,240}$ om. it, rightly, for it is only a doublet, Siev., *cf.* Gr., Marti.

THE INVASION OF THE LOCUST ARMY (2^{1-14}).

This address places us in the midst of the excitement over the approach of the locust swarm. The alarm-horn is to be sounded on the temple hill to warn the people of the imminent danger, v. ^{1a}. *Already a huge army of locusts, the like of which has never been seen, has settled on the mountains, v.* $^{2a\beta b}$, *and has begun its destructive work, which is so awful that it looks as if a fire had swept* *over the country wherever they have been, v.* [3]. *Vividly, Joel describes the appearance of the locust army and its speed, v.* [4], *the noise it makes when it marches and when it forages, v.* [5a], *its well-ordered and irresistible advance, vv.* [5b. 7. 8], *and its attack upon the city, v.* [9]. *Then after this graphic and rapid description he calls to repentance; even now it is not too late to implore Yahweh for mercy for He is gracious and may yet be prevailed upon to leave enough at least for the daily sacrifices, vv.* [12-14].

The interpolator had explained the locusts in 1^{15} as the vanguard of the day of Yahweh whose approach they heralded. In this address, 2^{1-14}, he has again inserted several verses ($^{1b.\ 2a\alpha.\ 6.\ 10.\ 11}$) which connect the locust plague with the day of Yahweh. See p. 50.

The two addresses, 1^{2-20} and 2^{1-14}, are complete in themselves and independent of each other; and it is certain that they were not delivered at the same time. In ch. 1 the locusts had already come, swarm after swarm, and the basis of the appeal to Yahweh is the awful condition of the country due to the locusts and the drought. Ch. 2 presents a different phase of the plague. The drought is not mentioned, but the locusts are advancing and have begun their destructive work, quickly reducing the fruitful landscape to a desolate wilderness. It appears thus to have been the first swarm of the several that succeeded each other. The visitation seems to Joel altogether unprecedented and he takes pains to describe the appearance and the march of this strange army in detail. The swarm here described cannot have come after the situation had become as depicted in ch. 1. In view of this it is most reasonable to see in v. [14b] an expression of the hope that by Yahweh's gracious intervention enough may yet be left for the daily sacrifices whose performance Joel sees threatened, while in ch. 1 they had already been suspended. In point of time 2^{1-14} was therefore delivered earlier than 1^{2-20}, but whether Joel himself or an editor is responsible for the present arrangement cannot be decided. Possibly the wrong interpretation of 2^{15-17} as part of the address of 2^{1-14} had something to do with it, see on 2^{15-17}. There can, however, be no question that from a purely literary point of view ch. 1 serves as a better introduction than ch. 2.

WARNING OF AN UNPARALLELED LOCUST INVASION AND ITS RAVAGES (2^{1-3}).

[1] Blow the horn in Zion,
sound the alarm on My holy mountain!
Let all the inhabitants of the land tremble!

[*"For the day of Yahweh comes, for it is near,*
[2] *A day of darkness and gloom,*
A day of clouds and deep darkness!"]

For black on the mountains is scattered
a great and powerful people.
Its like has not been from of old,
nor shall be again after it,
For years of generation upon generation.

[3] Before them the fire devours,
and behind them burns a flame!
Like the garden of Eden is the land before them,
but a desolate desert behind them,
And nothing whatever escapes them!

Four strs., of which the second is an insertion, (1) consists of a hexameter + a trimeter, (2) of a trimeter + a hexameter (or if read more rapidly a tetrameter), (3) and (4) of two hexameters followed by a trimeter, each. The trimeter in (3) and (4) may be secondary.

1–2. One sometimes has the feeling that Joel was a priest, for his interest in the priests and in the temple services was very great. But there is nothing to prove this.—**1.** Again he addresses the priests, though he does not mention them by name, *Sound the horn in Zion, and give the alarm in My holy mountain!* From the height of the temple hill the alarm is to be sounded, by the blast of the horn and perhaps also by shouting, so that Jerusalem and the surrounding parts may be warned of the impending danger. It is not necessary to suppose that the people who were to be warned lived all in Jerusalem or so near by that they could all hear the sound of the alarm-horn, for the signal was doubtless passed from place to place, beginning on the temple hill. Of course, it is only the land of Yahweh that is to be thus warned. The inevitable result of the alarm is expressed here by a further jussive, *let all the inhabitants of the land tremble!* *Cf.* Am. 3^6, *Shall the alarm-horn be* *sounded in a city and the people not be afraid?* The people would usually flock to the fortified cities, here Jerusalem, *cf.* Je. 6^{17}, to escape the threatened danger. The reason for calling them together to Jerusalem is not stated, but it is clear from $2^{15\,ff.}$ 1^{14}. The alarm-horn, *shōphār*, was the curved horn of a cow or ram used as a musical instrument. The prophet speaks this summons in the name of Yahweh, for he says *in My holy mountain*. This is a slight indication of the secondary character of v. $^{1b.\,2a\alpha}$, where Yahweh is referred to in the 3d pers. For other arguments see p. 50. The interpolator gives the approach of the day of Yahweh as the reason for sounding the alarm and for the fear of the people, *for the day of Yahweh comes, for it is near!* *Cf.* 1^{15} 4^{14}. He continues with a literal quotation from Zp. 1^{15}.—**2.** *A day of darkness and gloom, a day of clouds and deep darkness*, *cf.* for the latter part also Ez. 34^{12}. This is the prophetic conception of the day of Yahweh, *cf.* Am. 5^{18-20}. Darkness and gloom are figurative for disaster and despair. In Zp. 1^{15} the phrases had nothing to do with locusts. And indeed the terms are too strong for a locust swarm. Observers speak frequently of the eclipse-like hiding of the sun by a locust swarm, but never in this exaggerated manner of thick darkness. It need nevertheless not be denied that the interpolator may have used these particular phrases because "a flight of locusts, as it approaches, presents the appearance of a black cloud, which, as it passes, obscures the sun, and even sometimes darkens the whole sky" (Dr.). But this alone does not explain the use of these strong terms. The writer took them from the prophetic vocabulary. Unfortunately, by inserting his interpolation at just this point he has created the impression, as if he identified the day of the locusts with the day of Yahweh, which he clearly does not according to 1^{15}. —Joel thought only of the locusts and not of the day of Yahweh and he meant to warn the people of the approach of their terrible army, *as blackness, darkness, a great and powerful nation is spread out on the mountains*. They are so numerous that the mountains are black with them. In Ex. 10^{14} there were so many "that the land was darkened" as they covered the face of the whole land. *Cf.* Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, p. 416 *f.*, "The whole face of the mountain [Lebanon] was black with them." The point emphasised here is the great multitude. This seems a much better reading than the transl. *as dawn spread on the mountains*, though the descriptions by travellers of the shining yellow brightness caused by the reflection of the rays of the sun on the wings of the locusts have often been adduced for the lifelikeness of this comparison. GASm., *e. g.*, says, p. 404, "No one who has seen a cloud of locusts can question the realism even of this picture: the heavy gloom of the immeasurable mass of them, shot by gleams of light where a few of the sun's imprisoned beams have broken through or across the storm of lustrous wings. This is like dawn beaten down on the hill-tops, and crushed by rolling masses of cloud in conspiracy to prolong the night." But this is a description of a flying locust swarm, here they are on the ground, on the mountains, see also v. [5]. *On the mountains* defines the place where the locusts are spread out, not where the dawn is. It is such an awful swarm that it has no parallel in history, *cf.* 1[2. 3], *the like of it has never been before, nor shall be any more afterward* (lit. *after it*) *all through* (lit. *to*) *the years of generation after* (lit. *and*) *generation*. The parallel to the first part of this in Ex. 10[14] shows that this is merely a strong and common way of expressing the extraordinary and unique character of the visitation. Joel did not think of the Exodus passage when he wrote this.—**3.** He likens the destruction caused by the locusts to a fire which precedes and follows them on their march: *A fire devours before them, and a flame burns after them.* This figure is so appropriate for the devastation of the country by the locusts that travellers have frequently employed it.* Joel describes the locusts as an invading army in vv. [2. 4 ff.] and the figure must have been present in his mind also in v. [3]. As a host of barbarians invades the country, burning, destroying and pillaging everything, so also these locusts. Quickly the fertile fields disappear, *like*

---

* "Wherever they come, the ground seems burned, as it were with fire." "I have myself observed that the places where they had browsed were as scorched as if the fire had passed there." "They covered a square mile so completely, that it appeared, at a little distance, to have been burned and strewn over with brown ashes." (Quoted by Pu.) Of the locust plague in Palestine on June 13–15, 1865, an observer remarked, "the trees are as barren as in England in winter, but it looks as if the whole country had been burnt by fire" (*Eccles. Gazette*, 1865, p. 55, quoted by Dr.). "Bamboo groves have been stripped of their leaves and left standing like saplings after a rapid bush fire. . . . and grass has been devoured so that the bare ground appeared as if burned" (*Standard*, Dec. 25, 1896, quoted by Dr.).

the garden of Eden the land was before them, but after them it is a desolate wilderness! The two extremes of wonderful fertility and absolute barrenness are used quite effectively. For the garden of Eden, with its proverbial fruitfulness, *cf.* Gn. 2^8, for the same comparison see Ez. 36^{35} and Gn. 13^{10} (the garden of Yahweh), Is. 51^3 (the garden of Yahweh parall. to Eden); for the trees of Eden, *cf.* Ez. $31^{9.\,16.\,18}$. Again observers vouch for the accuracy of the description of the destruction.* It is clear that Joel meant here the devastation caused by the locusts, and not the drought which acc. to ch. 1 accompanied and accentuated the plague. The drought cannot yet have set in at the time of the appearance of this swarm, which must have been the first of the series, if we are to take Joel's words at all seriously. And *nothing whatever escapes them* is again true to life.†

THE ADVANCE AND ATTACK OF THE LOCUST ARMY (2^{4-9}).

[4] Their appearance is as the appearance of horses,
and like war-horses they run.
[5] Like the rattling of chariots (it sounds)
(as) they leap on the tops of the mountains,

Like the crackling of a flame of fire
that devours stubble.
(They are) like a powerful nation,
set in battle-array.

[[6] *Nations are in anguish before them*
all faces grow crimson.]

---

* "Everywhere, where their legions march, verdure disappears from the country, like a curtain which is folded up; trees and plants stripped of leaves and reduced to their branches and stalks, substitute, in the twinkling of an eye, the dreary spectacle of winter for the rich scenes of spring." "Desolation and famine mark their progress, all the expectation of the husbandman vanishes; his fields, which the rising sun beheld covered with luxuriance, are before evening a desert." (Quoted by Pu.)

† "They ate every herb of the land, and all the fruit of the trees which the hail had left: and there remained not any green thing, either tree or herb of the field, through all the land of Egypt" (Ex. 10^{15}). "Where these destructive swarms alight, not a leaf is left upon the trees, a blade of grass in the pastures, nor an ear of corn in the field." "On whatever spot they fall, the whole vegetable produce disappears. Nothing escapes them, from the leaves of the forest to the herbs on the plain." (Quoted by Pu.)

[7] Like warriors they run,
like soldiers they advance.
They march each in his own way,
and do not entangle their paths.

[8] None pushes the other.
each goes on his own track,
They plunge through the weapons
and are not held back.

[9] They rush upon the city,
they run upon the walls,
They climb into the houses,
through the windows they enter.

Five strs., (1) consists of a hexameter + a pentameter, (2) of two tetrameters; v. [6] is an inserted hexameter, (3) of a tetrameter + a hexameter, (4) of a hexameter + a tetrameter, (5) of two tetrameters (staccato style).

4. Now this army is described more in detail, and first of all, the appearance of the single locusts. The head of a locust looks so much like that of a horse that Joel says *their appearance is as the appearance of horses.* "If one carefully considers the head of the locust," says Theodoret, "he will find it exceedingly like that of a horse." The Arabs use the same metaphor to this day, *cf.* Tristram, *Nat. Hist. Bib.*, p. 314, and the Germans call the locust *Heupferd*, the Italians *cavallette.* Note also the description in Rev. 9^7, "and the shapes of the locusts were like unto horses prepared for war." But not only their appearance but also their speed is likened to that of horses, *and like war-horses they run.* In Jb. 39^{20} the swiftness of the horse is compared to that of the locust, *hast thou given the horse his might, . . . hast thou made him to leap as a locust?* There are a number of archaic imperfect forms in this and the foll. verses. They are used purposely to bring out the whole weight and power of the attack, they deepen the impression of terror and awe.—**5.** The noise made by the flight of a vast locust swarm is compared to the rattling of swiftly moving chariots. *Like the rattling of chariots* (*it sounds as*) *they leap on the tops of the mountains.* The same comparison is made in Rev. 9^9, *And the sound of their wings was as the sound of chariots, of many horses rushing to war.* Modern observers have also been impressed by the great noise the advancing swarm makes.* It is, of course, the locusts that leap on the tops of the mountains, where Joel had seen them in v. [2], and not the chariots, which do not leap on or over mountain tops. The noise the locusts make when feeding is compared to the crackling of a fire: *(It sounds) like the crackling of a flame of fire that devours stubble.* The same comparison is made by ancient and modern observers.† Now they approach and they appear *like a strong nation—set in battle array*, ready for the attack. —**6.** This verse interrupts the description of the march of the locusts which began in v. [5] and is continued in v. [7]. The mention of the *nations* suggests that it was inserted by the day of Yahweh interpolator. See p. 50. The interpolator connects the locust plague so closely with the day of Yahweh, *cf.* also vv. [10. 11], that he can speak of *nations* as writhing in terror at the approach of the awful army, while Joel would have thought only of Judah. If the verse should, however, after all be genuine, we must read with a slight change, *before them hearts are in anguish,—all faces grow crimson*, and the impression of great terror caused by the locusts would be portrayed. We may then compare the words of Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, XI, 35, "they overshadow the sun, the nations looking up with anxiety, lest they should cover their lands," and of Burckhardt, *Notes*, II, 91, "the Bedouins who occupy the peninsula of Sinai are frequently driven to despair by the multitude of locusts which constitute a land plague" (Pu.).—**7.** The description of the march of the attacking host is now continued. *Like warriors they run*, as they charge, *like soldiers they advance.* In perfect order, like a regular, disciplined army, *they march, every one in his own way, and they do not entangle their paths.* There is no confusion in their ranks which would impede their rapid advance. They move in straight lines, none crossing the other's track. *The locusts have no king, yet go they forth all of them in bands*, says Pr. 30[27].—**8.**

---

* "What strikes every one as they approach is the strange rustling of millions on millions of crisp wings."—C. Horne, in Hardwicke's *Science Gossip*, 1871, p. 80 (Dr.). Foskal compares it to the sound of a great cataract, *Descript. animal.*, p. 87 (van H.). Thomson, *l. c.*, p. 416 *f.*, wrote, "The noise made by them in marching and foraging was like that of a heavy shower falling on a distant forest." GASm. speaks of it as "less like the whirring of wings than the rattle of hail or the crackling of bush on fire," p. 399.

† *E. g.*, by Cyril, *dum prostratas fruges dentibus commolunt, ceu flammis vento diffundente crepitantibus;* by Riley, *Riverside Nat. Hist.*, II, p. 197, who likens it to "the crackling of a prairie fire"; by Newman *Hist. of Insects*, V, 1, who says, "The sound of their feeding, when in swarms, is as the rushing of flames driven by the wind" (Dr.).

There is no crowding, *none pushes the other*, lit. *his brother*, *each goes in his own track.* This remarkable order and regularity in their march with its soldier-like precision have often been observed.* To this regularity they add a sheer irresistible power of attack: *and they thrust themselves*, or *plunge through the weapons* with which the people try to check their advance. All efforts are vain, *they are not stopped.*†—**9.** *They rush upon the city*, *they* (scale and) *run upon the walls*, *they climb up into the houses*, *they enter through the windows.*‡ The Eastern windows have no glass, they are at most latticed. So "they flood through the open, unglazed windows and lattices; nothing can keep them out," GASm., p. 403.§ The staccato character of the rhythm is evidently intended, it brings out the movement of the advancing and attacking hosts with great realism. The rhythmic tone corresponds exactly to the graphic description and heightens its effect.

---

* Jerome wrote, "This we have seen lately in this province [Palestine]. For when the hosts of locusts came, and filled the air between heaven and earth, they flew, by the disposal of God's ordaining in such order, as to hold each his place, like the minute pieces of mosaic, fixed in the pavement by the artist's hands so as not to incline to one another a hair's breadth." Morier, *l. c.*, pp. 98 *ff.*, described them thus, "They seemed to be impelled by one common instinct, and moved in one body, which had the appearance of being organised by a leader. . . . They seemed to march in regular battalions, crawling over everything that lay in their passage, in one straight front" (Pu.). Another observed, "The roads were covered with them, all marching and in regular lines, like armies of soldiers, with their leaders in front," *Journ. Sacr. Lit.*, Oct., 1865, pp. 235 *f.* (Dr.). GASm. saw that "though they drifted before the wind there was no confusion in their ranks. They sailed in unbroken lines, sometimes straight, sometimes wavy," p. 399.

† "All the opposition of man to resist their progress was in vain. . . . Though our men broke their ranks for a moment, no sooner had they passed the men than they closed again, and marched forward through hedges and ditches as before," *Journ. Sacr. Lit.*, Oct., 1865, pp. 235 *f.* (Dr.). Thomson, *l. c.*, pp. 296 *ff.*, gives this vivid description, "Toward the end of May we heard that thousands of young locusts were on their march up the valley toward our village: we accordingly went forth to meet them, hoping to stop their progress, or at least to turn aside their line of march. . . . Their number was astounding: the whole face of the mountain was black with them. On they came like a disciplined army. We dug trenches and kindled fires, and beat and burnt to death heaps upon heaps, but the effort was utterly useless. They charged up the mountain side, and climbed over rocks, walls, ditches, and hedges, those behind coming up and passing over the masses already killed." Shaw, *Travels in Barbary*, pp. 256 *ff.*, wrote of similar endeavours to stop the progress of the locusts. But "the trenches were quickly filled up, and the fires put out by infinite swarms succeeding one another; whilst the front seemed regardless of danger, and the rear pressed on so close that a retreat was impossible" (Pu.).

‡ "We have seen this done," says Theodoret, "not by enemies only, but by locusts also. For not only flying, but creeping up the walls also, they enter the houses through the openings for light" (Pu.). And Bar-Hebræus similarly, "A.D., 784, there came the flying locust, and wasted the corn and left its offspring; and this came forth and crawled, and scaled walls and entered houses by windows and doors" (Pu.).

§ "They entered the inmost recesses of the houses, were found in every corner, stuck to our clothes, and infested our food," Morier, *l. c.*, p. 100.

1. שופר *alarm-horn*, *cf.* Dr.'s note and illustrations on Am. 2^{2}.—והריעו some mss., 𝔊 𝔙 om. ו conj.—ירגזו juss., 𝔊 וירגזו, 𝔊$^{\text{B}\aleph\text{Q}*}$ *καὶ συγχυθήτωσαν*, 𝔊$^{\text{A}}$ *καὶ συναχθήτωσαν*, so 𝔖$^{\text{H marg.}}$, the same confusion in 2^{10}.—בא prtc. not pf., the day is near, but has not yet arrived. Du. transposes עַם רב ועצום of v. ^{2} after כי בא, which is attractive but arbitrary.—**2.** Following Abulwalid and Tanchumi, Gr., Du. point more correctly כְּשְׁחֹר *as darkness*, *blackness*, *cf.* La. 4^{8}.—The reading of one cod. פרוש על תבור seems to be due to Ho. 5^{1}.—For juss. יֹסֵף read יוֹסִף, Mas. pointing is perhaps due to *scriptio defectiva*, or it expresses the wish that it *may* not occur again. Siev. om.—עד שני דור ודור is not absolutely necessary, but the parall. מִן־הָעוֹלָם argues for its genuineness.—**3.** אכלה pf. is used because of the following. It is not necessary to punctuate אֹכְלָה. פליטה is often the technical term for those who have escaped the great judgment, *cf.* Is. 4^{2}, and on that account, probably, Du. om. the whole clause as part of the day of Yahweh interpolation of vv. $^{1b.\,2}$. 𝔗 also connects it with the day of Yahweh ואף־שׁזאב לית בה לרשׁעיא. But it is not necessary to take פליטה in that sense here.—לו refers back to עם, v. ^{2}, *nothing has escaped them*. Gr. suggests לָנוּ, but that gives a different shade of meaning. לו has the force of מִמֶּנּוּ here, Ki., AE. The pf. היתה is used with reference to the preceding. וגם used for emphasis, *and nothing whatever* escapes them; *cf.* German, *und da ist auch nichts, das.*—**4.** פרשים 𝔊 *ἱππεῖς*, 𝔙 *equites*, AV., RV. *horsemen*, RVm. *war-horses*. The latter is preferable, parall. סוסים. Note the solemn archaic endings, *cf.* Holz., p. 120.—ירוצון 𝔊 *καταδιώξονται*, in v. ^{7} *δραμοῦνται*; Je. 49^{19} 50^{44} *ἐκδιώκειν*, 𝔊 = 𝔐.—Siev. om. כֵּן.—**5.** For כקול מרכבות Gr., Me. read כמרכבות, but this is awkward, for chariots do not leap on mountain tops.—כעם עצום 𝔊 𝔖 add רַב וְ from v. ^{2}.—עֱרוּךְ the usual pointing would be עָרוּךְ, but *cf.* Ges. $^{\S\,22.\,4.\,\text{n.}\,2}$, Kö. II, § 130, 3a, cstr. st. expresses *marshalled for battle*, *cf.* קְרֻעֵי בְגָדִים 2 S. 13^{21}, נְשׂוּי פֶּשַׁע, Ps. 32^{1}.

6. For עמים Ehr. suggests מֵעַיִם which would be parall. to כל־פנים, *cf* Je. 4^{19}. This would remove the strongest objection to the genuineness of the verse.—קבצו פארור is a technical term for exhibiting signs of fear, but its exact meaning is debated. The phrase occurs only here and Na. 2^{11}. It is translated (a) *all faces grow pale*, Cred., Hi., Wü., RV., *cf.* Je. 30^{6} וְנֶהֶפְכוּ כָל־פָּנִים לְיֵרָקוֹן; or (b) *all faces grow red, crimson*, Ew., Me., We., *cf.* פני להבים פניהם Is. 13^{8}; or (c) *all faces shall gather blackness*, AV., GASm. (a) assumes that קבץ = אסף as in v. ^{10} וְכוֹכָבִים אָסְפוּ נָגְהָם, *gather in*, *withdraw*, but it is not used thus elsewhere. קבץ means to *collect*, *gather together*, אסף *to gather in*, *withdraw*. (a) is therefore contrary to usage. פארור is connected with פרור *pot*, by 𝔊 𝔙. Some derive the meaning of *blackness* from this connection, others that of *redness*. The latter is the more likely and (b) is the most probable translation, *all faces have gathered*, *acquired redness*. See Hpt., *JBL.*, XXVI, p. 43. Others derive פארור from פאר, *cf.* BDB., and translate *beauty* or *color*.

Ehr. translates *every face betrays that which is within.* Ginsburg: פָּרוּר קרי. 𝔊 *ὡς πρόσκαυμα χύτρας* seems to have read כְּ with a noun for קבצו. Pr 10^5 קיץ is translated (wrongly) by *καῦμα*.—**7.** חומה is omitted by Siev. because of the metre and of the context, in which the climbing of the wall is premature, *cf.* v. ^{9}. It appears indeed to be due to dittog., the copyist's eye lighting upon מלחמה after he had written יַעֲלוּ.—עָלָה is a military term for *marching, advancing.*—יעבטון would be lit. *they borrow* or *lend*, but the explanation they do not lend their paths, *i. e.*, each one maintains his own and does not allow another to take it, does not sound natural. And the difficulty of this term has long been felt. One ms. reads ולא יבעטון, another ולא יעלטון, 𝔗 explains by מעכבין. 𝔊 *ἐκκλίνωσαν*, 𝔖, 𝔙 *declinabunt* may point to an original יַטּוּן (Gr.), or יְעַוּוּן (Siev.), or יְעַוְּתוּן (We., GASm., Marti). The last is the most probable. To read יעבתון is not so advisable, because the reading in Mi. 7^3 where it occurs is dub., though the root meaning of עבת, *to wind, weave, twist*, is well established. If Syr. *ʿabaṭ* means *to be mixed up, entangled*, as van H. claims, and if it could be used with *paths* (*cf.* also Scholz: *verbinden, complicare*), why did 𝔖 not use it in his translation?—אֹרְחוֹתָם for אָרְחוֹתָם.—**8.** ירחקון 𝔊 *ἀφέξεται*, Aq. *συντρίψει*, Σ *θλίψει*. 𝔊 = some Heb. mss. ירחקון, 𝔐 is correct.—גבר is used here to avoid the repetition of איש. מְסִלָּה is usually the artificially constructed road, here parall. to ארחותם and דרכיו, GASm.: "*high-road*, as if defined and heaped up for him alone." It is simply due to the desire to avoid the same term in close succession that Joel uses here מסלה.—𝔊 read *καταβαρυνόμενοι ἐν τοῖς ὅπλοις αὐτῶν*, apparently = כְּבֵדִים בִּכְלֵיהֶם (בַּכֵּלִים), though Wü. thinks that *ἐν τοῖς ὅπλοις αὐτῶν* is = בְּסִבְלָתוֹ. Van H. regards 𝔊 as containing the better text and reads בְּמַסַּכְתּוֹ, *dans son équipement*, Du. reads *with his sword.* But on the whole 𝔐 is preferable, though perhaps not altogether correctly preserved.—ובעד השלח יפלו 𝔊 *καὶ ἐν τοῖς βέλεσιν αὐτῶν πεσοῦνται*, apparently בְּיַד for בעד, so Gr., Du. שלח occurs only in late writings, Ne. 3^{15} $4^{11.\,17}$ 2 Ch. 23^{10} 32^5 Jb. 33^{18} 36^{12}; it is significant that the parall. of 2 Ch. 23^{10} in 2 K. 11^{11} has כלים instead. It is used collectively. *Cf.* Ar. *silaḥun*, German, *Geschoss*, missile. נפל does not only mean *to fall* (unintentionally) but also *to throw oneself, plunge.* בעד השלח is similar to בעד החלונים, v. ^{9}, *through the weapons*, *i. e.*, they thrust themselves in between the weapons, round about them, RV. 𝔙 *sed et per fenestras cadent* is due to Jerome's misunderstanding of his teacher's remark that (the construction of) בעד השלח is the same as בעד החלונים (v. ^{9}), *cf.* Rahmer. Du. translates, *sie fallen mit Waffengewalt ein.* Siev. divides differently, joining ילכון to בעד השלח and taking יפלו with the foll., but ילכון cannot be spared in the previous line.—יבצעו from √ בצע *to cut off, break off.* Usually it is thought that the obj., *their course*, is omitted, RV., though Marti takes it absolutely in the sense that they burst through the weapons and then close up their ranks at once so that there is no break. But it is very doubtful whether יבצעו can mean this absolutely. 𝔊 *καὶ οὐ μὴ συντελεσθῶσιν*, Θ *συντριβήσονται*, 𝔙 *et non demolientur*, note ולא, which also many Heb. mss. have, and the pass., some Gk. mss. and Σ have the act. AE., *et al.*, explain it as equivalent to לא יִפָּצְעוּ *they are not wounded*, so AV., Gr. emends text thus. But this is contrary to the facts. 𝔗 connects בצע with בֶּצַע *gain*, ולא מקבלי ממון *and they take no money;* this is due to 𝔗's allegorical interpretation of the locusts. Ehr. transl. *and fall into the pond and are not drowned*, comparing שלח with Ar. *salaḥun*(?), and reading יִטְבְּעוּ for יִבְּצָעוּ. But this is contrary to the facts. Evidently what was meant is that nothing can stop them in their march, neither weapons nor walls. Since it is doubtful whether יבצעו abs. can express this it seems advisable to read ולא יֵעָצְרוּ for לא יבצעו *they are not stopped*. Du. takes בעיר, v. ^{9}, with יבצעו, *they do not break off at the city*.—**9.** ישקו √ שקק connected with שוק *leg*, *to leg*, *scamper*, *rush*, *they rush upon the city*, ב, *cf.* Is. 33^4. 𝔖 *they climb*, Gr. emends accordingly יִסָּקוּ √ סלק. But שקק may mean this, without emendation, by virtue of its connection with שוק, ב as in בבתים, *they climb into the city*. One may question whether בעיר was then not rather בַּקִּיר *upon the wall*, but this is expressed in the next phrase בחומה ירצון. The transl. *they rush upon the city* is therefore preferable. 𝔊 *ἐπιλήμψονται* took ישקו from Aram. נשק (Vol.).—כגנב generic pl., 𝔊 𝔖 correctly translate by pl., Gr. emends כגנבים. The comparison is not appropriate here, and כגנב is to be regarded as a later gloss (Du.).

INSERTION CONCERNING THE DAY OF YAHWEH ($2^{10.\ 11}$).

10–11. These verses are by the day of Yahweh interpolator and do not belong to Joel's original description of the advance and attack of the locusts. The interpolator connects the day of the locusts so closely with that of Yahweh that they are practically one. The locusts are here not the precursors and heralds of the day of Yahweh but the terrible army which He uses to execute His will on His great day. This raises, of course, at once the question whether the interpolator regarded the locusts as real locusts or rather as apocalyptic forces. See p. 50. The accompanying cosmical phenomena here described are not caused by the locusts. We have here no ordinary thunder-storm nor the frequently witnessed darkening of the sky by a flight of locusts but the tremendous convulsions and signs accompanying the day of Yahweh.

10. *"Before them the earth trembles*
the heavens quake.
Sun and moon grow dark,
and the stars withdraw their splendour.

11. *And Yahweh utters His voice*
before His army,
For very great is His host
yea, powerful he that executes His word.

For great is the day of Yahweh and very awful,
And who can endure it?"

Three strs., (1) and (2) consist of a pentameter + a hexameter each, (3) of a hexameter. They may all together form only one str.

10. *Before them the earth trembles, the heavens quake.* Preceded and accompanied by these great manifestations the locusts approach. They are not due to them. To heighten the fear and deepen the awe, the earth as well as the heavens tremble. The heavens are thought of as a solid vault, *cf.* Am. 8^{6} 2 S. 22^{8} Is. 13^{13}. *The sun and the moon grow dark, and the stars withdraw their brightness,* 4^{15}. A terrible thunder-storm accompanies the earthquake on this "day of clouds and deep darkness," 2^{2}.—**11.** *And Yahweh utters His voice* in awful thunder peals, for the thunder is His voice, sometimes also the rumbling and roaring of the earthquake; but here it is evidently the thunder, *cf.* Am. 1^{2} Hb. $3^{10.\ 11}$ Ps. 18^{14} 46^{7}. The locusts are called *His army*, *cf.* v. ^{25}, and *the agent* or *executor of His word* or *purpose*. Before them He thunders as if to enhance the awful noise of the tramp of His vast army. They are coming on His *great and exceedingly terrible day.* The day is so awful that the prophet wonders *who may endure it*, *cf.* Mal. $3^{2.\ 23}$ Je. 10^{10}. Evidently the literal locusts are lost sight of here, and they are no longer heralds or precursors of Yahweh's day, but the agents of His will.

CALL TO HEARTFELT REPENTANCE (2^{12-14}).

12–14. This call to repentance originally followed directly upon v. ^{9}. As it now stands it is connected with the interpolation of the day of Yahweh, and was intended by the interpolator to be taken as a call to repent even now, before it was too late, though the day of Yahweh has not only been heralded but actually begun, in order that the judgment of Yahweh may yet be averted. *Cf.* the similar interpolation in 1[15]. But the verses themselves give no hint of such an intention on the part of Joel. It is the extreme of the calamity to which the locust swarms might reduce them, *cf.* v. [14b], that he seeks to avert by Yahweh's gracious intervention which he hopes to secure by the earnest, whole-hearted penitence of the people. Of the day of Yahweh he does not speak.

[12] Yet even now, is Yahweh's oracle,
Turn unto Me with all your heart,
With fasting and weeping and mourning,
[13] but rend your hearts and not your garments!

And return to Yahweh your God,
for gracious is He and compassionate,
Long-suffering and plenteous in love,
and relents of the evil.

[14] Who knows but He will turn and relent,
and leave behind Him a blessing,
(For) meal-offerings and libations
to Yahweh your God?

Three strs., (1) and (2) consist of two hexameters, each, (3) of a hexameter + a tetrameter.

12. *But even now* he believes that the worst may be averted. The locust swarms are working terrible havoc. But in his spirit Joel feels the stirring of the proph. impulse to summon the people, in Yahweh's own name. *Even now, says Yahweh, turn unto Me with your whole heart!* "with the entire force of your moral purpose" (Dr.). The heart is not only the seat of the emotions, but also of the intellect and the will. In Deuteronomy *and with your whole soul* is usually added. It is important to note the stress laid on this whole-hearted repentance because Joel joins to this inner requirement all the external signs of penitence, *fasting, weeping and lamenting*, which characterise the day of contrition also in Est. 4[3]. He does not speak of the sins of the people at all, but he appeals to the general feeling of sinfulness which expresses itself in these modes of penitence.—**13.** But while he endorses these external modes he insists on the repentance of the heart, *rend your* *hearts rather than your garments!* While he differs, *e. g.*, from Amos and Isaiah in valuing the cult, he is no mere ritualist. He recognises the need of deep, sincere repentance and presses it home in this striking manner. *Cf.* Je. 4^4 Ps. 51^{19} Ez. 36^{26} Zc. 7^{12}. Rending of the garments was a sign of grief, *cf.* Lev. 13^{45} Je. 36^{24}. But it might be only outward and formal. That is not enough. So far Yahweh had spoken. Now the prophet expands and interprets this call. *And turn to Yahweh your God, for He is gracious and full of compassion, slow to anger and of great loving kindness.* The reason for hope even *in extremis* lies in the wonderfully gracious character of Yahweh. The prophet uses the famous old phrase, *cf.* Ex. 34^6, which was used ever again, *e. g.*, Ps. 86^{15} 103^8 145^8 Ne. 9^{17}. Instead of *and truth* which is added in Ex. 34^6, both Joel and Jon. 4^2 read *and repenteth of the evil*, which he intended to bring upon the people. This is given here as one of Yahweh's attributes, also in Jon. 4^2, and implies, as Je. 18^8 $26^{3.\,13.\,19}$ Jon. 3^{10} show, that He always does this when certain conditions are fulfilled. So it has become characteristic of Him. On the basis of this gracious compassion of Yahweh the prophet builds his hope.—**14.** It is not absolutely certain, but *who knows He may turn*, from His purpose of judgment, *and repent* and show His compassion, *and leave behind Him*, as He turns back, *a blessing* in the tangible form of renewed fertility, so that the daily sacrifices, *the meal-offering and the drink-offering*, may be continued and thus the ordinary means of intercourse with Yahweh be insured.

10. שמש וירח קררו om. by some Gk. mss.—**11.** 𝔊 *ὅτι ἰσχυρὰ ἔργα λόγων αὐτοῦ* כִּי עָצוּם מַעֲשֵׂה דְבָרָיו, due to dittog. of מ, translating sg. freely by pl.—נורא 𝔊 *ἐπιφανής* 𝔙 *illustris*, as if from ראה.—יכילנו 𝔊 *ἔσται ἱκανὸς αὐτῇ*, Aq. Θ *ὑπομένει αὐτὴν*, 𝔙 *sufficiens*.—**12** וגם עתה 𝔊 *καὶ νῦν* 𝔙 *nunc ergo*, but this is too weak, *and even now!* though the danger is so great. German: *und auch jetzt noch*.—נאם יהוה 𝔊 adds *ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν*.—שׁוּב עַד, *cf.* Am. 4^6 Ho. 14^2.—Some Heb. mss. 𝔖 𝔙 om. ו before בצום, some mss. om. prep. ב in ובבכי and ובמספר. Some Gk. mss. add *καὶ ἐν σάκκῳ* after בצום.—**13.** ואל *rather than*, *cf.* Ehr. וְנִחָם prtc., not pf. with *waw subord.* (Hi.), for v. ^{13} describes God's character, v. ^{14} speaks of the possibility of pardon. In v. ^{14} ונחם pf. with *waw conj.*—**14.** מנחה ונסך stand in apposition to ברכה, which is a little harsh. AE., Ki.: שֶׁיַּעֲשׂוּ ממנו מנחה ונסך. Gr. proposes למנחה ונסך. If ל did not stand in the orig. it was surely meant. אלהיכם 𝔊 *ἡμῶν*, 𝔐 correct, *cf.* v. ^{13}.

THE GREAT PENITENTIAL ASSEMBLY AND ITS PRAYER FOR MERCY (2^{15-17}).

15–17. These verses are usually regarded as a reiterated appeal, *cf.* v. [1], to hold a solemn service of penitence and contrition in the temple. But another interpretation is perhaps more likely. Evidently v. [18] presupposes that the people have followed the prophet's exhortation to repentance. But this is nowhere expressly said in our text. To assume it, while not impossible, is not quite so easy, because we have narrative in v. [18], not proph. address. Why did the narrator omit this? Was it after all so self-evident? There is thus a break between v. [17] and v. [18]. It is somewhat strange, as Me. urged, that such a holy assembly to which even the suckling babes are summoned should have been *demanded* by the proph. But it does not seem impossible. Again it is somewhat strange that the particular place where the priests are to weep (!) and to pray should have been pointed out and assigned to them (Hi.), together with the specific formula of prayer which they are to use. But this is not inexplicable either. Hi. believed, therefore, that the *narrative* of the people's repentance began with v. [17], Joel describing it in the present tense and continuing in v. [18] in the past. But clearly it would be preferable to point the various tenses as narrative tenses in the past, which can be done without changing a single consonant. This removes some difficulties, but it puts the lacuna between v. [16] and v. [17]. There is then not so serious a break, it is true, but nevertheless a real one. It seems that we must go one step further and assume that the narrative begins with v. [15] and not with v. [17]. With v. [14] the proph. address comes to an effective close and a new section begins with v. [15]. If v. [17] is really the description of how the proph. demand was carried out, it does not tell us enough, for it speaks only of what the priests, and not at all of what the people did. V. [17] points, therefore, beyond itself and indicates that vv. [15. 16] are also description. As a description of what actually happened the assembly in which even the suckling babes were present is entirely in order.—This necessitates the punctuation of the verbs as perfects not as imperatives. And here an objection must be faced by pointing out that the staccato form of description, so unusual in Heb., corresponds altogether to the style of Joel in 1[7-12] 2[7-9]. The brief, abrupt sentences, unconnected by particles, are admirably adapted to bring before our imagination the quick action taken by priests and people. *They blew the horn in Zion, they sanctified a fast, called a solemn assembly, etc.*—Now everything is in order. There is no break between v. [17] and v. [18], or between v. [16] and v. [17]. Nothing is to be supplied in thought. The description of the calling of the assembly and of its character, of the place where the priests wept and prayed, as well as the formula of their prayer and Yahweh's answer—all this is exactly as we should desire it. And no change, even of a single consonant, is necessary for this.

[15]. They blew the horn in Zion,
they sanctified a fast,
They called a solemn assembly,
[16]. they gathered the people.

They consecrated the congregation,
they assembled the old men,
They gathered the babes,
even the infants at the breast.
The bridegroom came forth from his nuptial chamber,
and the bride from her bridal pavilion.

[17]. Between the porch and the altar
the priests were weeping,
The ministers of Yahweh, and said,
"Spare, O Yahweh, Thy people!

"And do not make Thy heritage a reproach,
a by-word among the peoples!
"Why should they say among the nations,
'Where is their God?' "

It is doubtful whether vv. [15. 16] are more than one str., but they may consist of two, as printed here. V. [17] also may be either one or two strs. As represented above, (1) consists of a pentameter + a tetrameter, (2) of two tetrameters + a pentameter, (3) of a pentameter + a hexameter, (4) of two pentameters. Note the staccato style in (1) and (2).

15. *Cf.* 2[1] and 1[14].—**16.** Though the subject is indefinite, it is evidently the priests who *gathered the people, they sanctified*, prepared everything for *an assembly*, a solemn cultic meeting. *They assembled the old men, gathered the children, even those that sucked the breasts.* Everybody was brought to the temple, young and old, to make the appeal to Yahweh as strong as possible. Acc. to Jon. 4^{21} Yahweh is moved to pity by the many children who cannot yet make moral distinctions. The old men are mentioned with the children and the babes, not as officials but because they might perhaps under ordinary circumstances not go to the temple on account of their age. But they came, their age and infirmity silently appealing for mercy. Everybody came, even the bridegroom and the bride, who felt least inclined to mourn and to weep and who ordinarily were excused from many functions and duties, *cf.* Dt. 24^{5}; acc. to *Berakhoth* 2^{5}, also from saying the prescribed prayers on their wedding day and even to the end of the following Sabbath if the marital function had not been fulfilled before. *The bridegroom came out of his nuptial chamber, and the bride out of her bridal pavilion*, in which their marriage was to be consummated.—**17.** In the inner court, between the porch at the east end of the temple, 1 K. 6^{3}, and the great altar of burnt-offering in front of it, 1 K. 8^{64} 2 Ch. 8^{12}, with their faces turned toward the sanctuary, *cf.* Ez. 8^{16} *per contra*, the priests, the ministers of Yahweh, $1^{9.\ 13}$, were weeping in genuine contrition. A similar scene is recorded in 1 Mac. 7^{36}, *And the priests went in and stood before the altar and the sanctuary and wept and said. . . .* The prayer of the priests is given, *Spare thy people, O Yahweh, And do not make thine inheritance a reproach and a by-word among the nations! Why should they say among the peoples, Where is their God?* They appeal to Yahweh to spare them because they are His people and His inheritance, *cf.* Dt. $9^{26.\ 29}$, and try to move Yahweh to intervene on their behalf because His non-interference will be interpreted falsely by the nations, *cf.* Ex. 32^{12} Nu. 14^{13-16} Dt. 9^{28}. They will begin to doubt Yahweh's efficiency and to mock Israel and Yahweh Himself by contemptuously asking, *Where is their God?* They see no evidence of His power. This appeal is constantly made in post-exilic times, *cf.* Ps. $42^{4.\ 11}$ 79^{10} 115^{2} Mi. 7^{10}. Yahweh's glorious name will be profaned by this taunt.—If the interpretation of vv. $^{15-17}$ as narrative, rather than as a reiterated appeal, holds good

vv. [18 ff.] simply continue the narrative, and there is an interesting parallel not only to v. [18] but to vv. [15-18] in Judith 4^{9-15}. Since ch. 1 contains a later address than ch. 2, the description of the assembly and its result, vv. [15 ff.], belongs really in point of time after ch. 1, and not directly after 2^{1-14}. The prayer of the priests which does not mention the locusts whose approach and arrival had been so vividly portrayed in $2^{1\text{ ff.}}$ is quite in line with this observation. And so is the promise in v. [19]. If vv. [15 ff.] were the direct continuation of vv. [1 ff.] we should expect an ardent prayer for the removal of the locusts before the whole harvest was destroyed. In vv. [18 ff.] the emphasis lies on the restoration of the fertility of the land. The removal of the locusts, v. [20], comes in almost incidentally. Some have regarded v. [20] as an insertion which did not belong to the original text.

YAHWEH'S ANSWER AND PROMISE OF RELIEF AND RESTORATION ($2^{18-20.\ 25.\ 26a}$).

This is the direct continuation of the narrative of vv. [15-17]. The tenses are narrative tenses and cannot be interpreted as referring to the future.

15. Then Yahweh became jealous for His land,
  and had pity on His people.
19. And Yahweh answered and said to His people,

Behold, I will send you
  corn and new wine and oil,
And ye shall be satisfied therewith.—
And I will not make you again
  a reproach among the nations.

20. And *the northerner* I will remove far from you,
  and will drive him into a dry and waste land,
His van into the eastern sea,
  and his rear into the western,
And stench and foul smell of him will arise,
  for I will do great things.

25. And I will restore unto you the rich fruits
  which the swarmer has eaten,

The lapper, the finisher and the shearer,
[*My great army*] which I sent among you.
26. And you shall eat in plenty and be satisfied.

Four strs., (1) introductory, consisting of a pentameter and a tetrameter, (2) of a hexameter + a dimeter + a hexameter, (3) of three hexameters, (4) of two hexameters + a trimeter.

18. The priests had appealed on behalf of the people to Yahweh's love and to the honour of His holy name. *And Yahweh became jealous for His land.* Strong and deep emotions were aroused in Him. He cannot bear to have His land and people treated thus scornfully by the nations nor the honour of His name defiled. *And He had pity on His people*, whom He after all loved as His own, though he had to discipline them.—**19.** *And Yahweh answered and said to His people*, most likely through His prophet, because His answer is quoted in direct form. Others believe that Yahweh spoke directly to His people, not in words, however, but in deeds, by removing the plague. *Behold, I will send to you* (*directly*) *corn and new wine and fresh oil*, of which they had been deprived by the locusts, 1^{10}, and of which they stood in such need, *and* (you shall have it in such abundance that) *you shall be satisfied with it. And I will no longer make you a reproach among the nations*, which they had become as a result of their direful condition, *cf.* v. ^{17}.—**20.** *And as for the northerner*, by this Joel must mean, if indeed he wrote this word, the locust swarm which contrary to all precedents had come from the north, for it is the fate of the locust swarm that is now described. It seems likely, however, that the term northerner which conjures up those dark prophecies concerning the enemy from the north of whom Je. 1^{14} and Ez. $38^{6.\ 15}$ 39^{2} had spoken and who had become a fixed feature of later eschatology is due to the interpolator of the day of Yahweh who slightly changed, as in v. ^{17}, the original text, in which Joel had spoken of the locust swarm. The removal of the locust swarm is mentioned after the promise of restored fertility of the land had been given. It does not appear to be the most pressing need at the time, as we should have expected if vv. $^{15\text{-}20}$ told what happened directly after the address of $2^{1\,\text{ff.}}$. But we saw that $2^{1\,\text{ff.}}$ are an earlier address than $1^{2\,\text{ff.}}$, and that $2^{15\,\text{ff.}}$ tell the story of the end of the plague and not of an episode, upon which the worse disaster described in $1^{2\,\text{ff.}}$ was yet to follow. Nevertheless, the promise of the removal of the locusts had to be added, esp. also because Yahweh wants to assure the people that the locust visitation shall not come again to cause them all this distress and shame, v. ^{19b}. So he says, *And as for the northerner I will remove him far away from you.* The Heb. expresses the burdensome character of the plague, the locusts had settled upon them and they will be removed far away *from upon* them. *And I will drive him, i. e.*, the main body of the swarm, *into a dry land and a waste*, the desert S. and SE. of Judah, where they will perish. The two ends of the army will be carried out into the sea, *its van into the Dead Sea*, lit. the front or eastern sea, *cf.* Ez. 47^{18} Zc. 14^{8}, *and its rear into the Mediterranean*, lit. the hinder or western sea. This idiomatic way of expressing E. and W. is due to the habit of facing eastward in fixing the points of the compass. What was in front was E., what was behind was W. The swarm lies on the whole land from E. to W. and each part is to be removed in the quickest possible way. Usually this is done by a wind, probably in this case also, though this is not mentioned. "There is no reason to suppose that the prophet has abandoned the realism which has hitherto distinguished his treatment of the locusts. The plague covered the whole land, on whose high watershed the winds suddenly veer and change. The dispersion of the locusts upon the deserts and the opposite seas was therefore possible at one and the same time. Jerome vouches for an instance in his own day" (GASm., p. 420).* "A wind rising first in the NW., and afterward gradually veering round to NE., would produce approximately the effects indicated" (Dr.). *Cf.* the description by Horne, *l. c.*, "The wind was blowing from the north-east, and they were borne along upon it. Afterward the wind veered round, and the locusts turned with it," (Dr.). In the desert and the sea the locust swarm will be completely destroyed, *that his stench and foul smell*, due to the decaying carcasses, *may come up*. The mention of this feature is another touch of realism. The awful odour cannot have been pleasant to the Jews, it was added to assure them of the total destruction of the locusts. Observers have noticed this feature.* V.^{20} is so true to life, and fits so exactly the fate of locust swarms, *cf.* also Ex. 10^{19}, that it cannot well be regarded as an insertion. It concludes with *for I will do great things.* Yahweh is still speaking, He will show His greatness by restoring fertility and by destroying the locusts. 𝔐's reading *for he has done great things*, *i. e.*, the locusts have acted overweeningly, is so improbable that many have preferred to omit the whole clause as secondary, but it is due to the editor.

---

* Jer. wrote, "In our times also we have seen hosts of locusts over Judea, which afterward, by the mercy of God, . . . a wind arising were carried headlong into the eastern and the western seas."

The composition of vv. $^{21-27}$. The poetical insertion of vv. $^{21-24}$ interrupts the speech of Yahweh in a way that can hardly have been intended by Joel. Style and phraseology are, however, so distinctly those of Joel that the verses cannot be regarded as a later insertion. But that Joel himself should have placed them here is improbable. They stood most likely at first directly after vv. $^{25.\,26a\alpha}$ where they concluded very beautifully chs. 1, 2. Since the displacement was hardly accidental, we may assume that the editor intended ch. 3 (Engl. 2^{28-32}) as the continuation of the promise of Yahweh and so placed the poem after v. ^{20}, which the phrase *for I will do great things* suggested as a suitable place for its insertion. But while it follows well enough upon v. ^{20}, vv. $^{25.\,26a}$ are torn apart by it from vv. $^{19.\,20}$ to which they inseparably belong. Another argument for v. ^{26} as the original place of the poem is found in v. ^{26} itself. The sentence *and you shall praise the name of Yahweh your God who has dealt wondrously with you*, is not a part of Yahweh's own words which are given in the 1st pers., *cf.* v. ^{25}. This difficulty disappears as soon as it is taken as a part of the poem, vv. $^{21-24}$. The poem, it will be noticed, is not rounded out to a conclusion in v. ^{24}. This is supplied by our sentence which is admirably suited to bring the poem to a satisfying close. Joel composed this poem some time after the promise of vv. $^{19.\,20.\,25.\,26a\alpha}$, for it expresses joy not over the promise but over the restoration of fertility which has already been experienced at least to some extent by the people, vv. $^{22.\,23}$, who are looking forward to a rich harvest, v. ^{24}. The poem formed originally the conclusion of the locust passages.

---

* Jer., "And when the shores of both seas (the Mediterranean and the Dead Sea) were filled with heaps of dead locusts which the waters had cast up, their stench and putrefaction was so noxious as to corrupt the air, so that a pestilence was produced among both beasts and men." Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, III, 71, quotes from Julius Obsequens, *De prodig.*, ch. xc., that the carcasses of a vast locust swarm which had been driven into the African sea were "cast back on the shores, and the air being infected thereby, such a pestilence arose that in the realm of Masinissa alone 800,000 men perished, and many more in the lands on the coasts. Then at Utica, out of 30,000 men in the prime of life, who were there, they assert that only ten remained." Cp. also Orosius, *Historiarum*, lib. V, 11, on this catastrophe at Utica, quoted by Pu. Similar observations of the awful odour produced by the decaying mass of locusts are given by modern writers. See Pu. and Dr.

This implies that vv. $^{26b.\ 27}$ are additions. V. ^{27} is composed of stereotyped phrases which have vital meaning in Deutero-Isaiah, Ezekiel and the Holiness Code, but are without real significance here where they are purely liturgical. Of course, even though Joel does not use hackneyed phrases, we should not necessarily assert that he was not the author were it not that the phrase *and you shall know that I am Yahweh your God,* followed by *who dwells in My holy mountain Zion,* recurs in 4^{17}, where it is quite in place. It would seem, therefore, that the editor was also responsible for 2^{27}. That several Gk. mss. omit v. ^{27} cannot be used as an argument in favour of the secondariness of v. ^{27}, because it was probably due to homoioteleuton, v. ^{27b} = v. ^{26a}. One might question whether v. ^{26b} is also secondary, if v. ^{27} is an addition. If genuine, Yahweh would probably have proceeded in the direct address *and ye shall never be ashamed* and not as here *and My people shall never be ashamed.* In v. ^{27b} this fits, but not in v. ^{26b}. This stylistic hint, slight as it is, indicates that v. ^{26b} is a doublet of v. ^{27b}. For the rounding out of the thought it is not needed since the same promise had been given in v. ^{19b}.

In accordance with our results we take up first vv. $^{25.\ 26a\alpha}$ which form the direct continuation of vv. $^{19.\ 20}$, then vv. $^{21-24.\ 26a\beta}$ which form the poetical comment on the restoration of fertility and finally vv. $^{26b.\ 27}$ which are later additions.

25. Continuing his promises Yahweh assures the people of full compensation for the deprivations which the successive swarms of locusts had caused. *And I will restore to you the rich fruits which the swarmer has devoured, the lapper, the finisher and the shearer.* 𝔐 has *the years* which the swarmer has devoured, but this is most probably due to a slight corruption of the text. On the names of the locust, *cf.* 1^{4}. *My great army* appears to be due to the interpolator who used this phrase in 2^{11}.—**26**$^{a\alpha}$. *And you shall eat in plenty, and be satisfied* because of the great abundance which Yahweh will give.

SONG OF JOY OVER THE BEGINNINGS OF THE RESTORATION ($2^{21-24.\ 26a\beta}$).

In this lyrical outburst of joy the prophet calls upon the land, v. ^{21}, *the animals, v.* ^{22}, *and the inhabitants of Jerusalem to rejoice over the restoration of fertility by Yahweh.*

In vv. $^{19.\ 20.\ 25.\ 26a\alpha}$ Yahweh promised deliverance, the prophet in this song speaks of the deliverance as past, the promise as fulfilled. He breaks forth into jubilant strains of deep joy, and an exquisitely rhythmic lyrical poem expresses his delight. It is one of the passages that has made students of Joel admire the beauty of his style. It reminds one of the lyrical passages with which Deutero-Isaiah interspersed his book.

21. Fear not, O ground, exult and rejoice,
for Yahweh has done great things!

22. Fear not, O beasts of the field,
for the pastures of the steppe are covered with new grass.
For the trees bear their fruit,
fig tree and grape-vine yield their produce.

23. And ye children of Zion, exult
and rejoice in Yahweh your God!
For He has given you food as (a token of your) justification,
and He has poured down for you rain [*fall rain and spring rain*],
as before.

24. And the threshing-floors shall be full of wheat,
and the vats shall overflow with new wine and fresh oil.
26. And ye shall praise the name of Yahweh, your God,
who has dealt so wondrously with you.

Four strs., (1) consists of a tetrameter + a trimeter, (2) of two hexameters, (3) of a pentameter + a hexameter, which is to be read rapidly. The metre argues against the originality of *fall rain and spring rain*. (4) consists of two heptameters.

21. *Fear not, O ground, exult and rejoice,* it had "mourned" before, 1^{10}, *for Yahweh has done great things,* as He had promised in v. ^{20}.—**22.** *Fear not, ye wild beasts,* lit. beasts of the field, who had to suffer so much, 1^{20}, *for the pastures of the steppe are covered with,* lit. have, *fresh, young grass,* those same pastures that were burnt, 1^{19}, *and the trees,* which had failed and were languishing, $1^{7.12}$, *have borne their fruit, the fig trees and the grape-vines,* coll. sg., *have yielded as much as they can bear,* lit. their strength. All this is spoken with strict antithetical reference to the description of ch. 1. It is due to his poetic impulse that Joel joined the reference to the bearing of the fruit trees, which of course is not strictly a cause of rejoicing for the wild animals.—**23.** Now he calls upon the *children of Zion,* strictly the inhabitants of Jerusalem only, but it would seem that he meant all who belong to Zion as children, who worship Yahweh there, *cf.* Ps. 87. *Exult and rejoice in Yahweh* *your God.* Contrast 1[16] where joy and rejoicing had gone away from the children of men. Their joy is to be full of gratitude for Yahweh, *for He has given you*, note the past tense, *nourishment* (𝔊) *for* (a token of) *justification*, showing that the right relation between Himself and His people has been re-established. *And* instead of the long drought *He has poured down*, lit. caused to come down, *abundant rain, the early rain as well as the latter rain*, *cf.* Je. 5[24], which come in October to November and in March to April respectively, the fall and spring rains, and which are indispensable for the fertility of the land. The early rain prepares the land for seed sowing, the latter is needed to nourish and ripen the growing crops. Joel looks back over some months. Yahweh had fulfilled His promise—the fall rains had come and the spring rains also *as aforetime*, in the years before the visitation.—**24.** And now he looks forward to a plentiful harvest when *the threshing-floors shall be full of wheat, and the vats shall overflow with new wine and fresh oil.* The threshing-floors were in the open air, when possible on or near the top of the hill where the wind would blow. They were quite primitive, consisting of a round piece of ground firmly stamped by the feet. On this the sheaves were spread out to be threshed. See an illustration of a modern threshing-floor in *EB.*, I, 83, *BD.*, I, 50. The grapes were trodden out by the feet in winepresses which were hewed out in the rock. They consisted usually of two vats, a larger one, eight or more feet square, which was on the upper side of a ledge of rock and rather shallow, and a smaller one, not quite half as large, which was sometimes two feet lower and three or more feet deep. This was connected by a large groove through which the juice flowed from the upper to the lower vat. This lower vat is meant in our text. Sometimes there were two or even three of them in connection with a press. The must was then passed from one to the other to clarify it. See an illustration in Benzinger, *Hebräische Archäologie*,[2] 1907, p. 143. Olives were also pressed in these presses, *cf.* Gethsemane = oil-press. See illustration in Benzinger, *l. c.*, p. 144.—**26**$^{a\beta}$. Full of joy over the prospect of such harvests Joel closes his poem, calling on the people to show their gratitude *and ye shall praise the name of Yahweh, your God, who has dealt wondrously with you.*

EDITORIAL LINK ($2^{26b.\ 27}$).

[And My people shall nevermore be put to shame.]
Ye shall know that I am in the midst of Israel,
and (that) I Yahweh am your God and none else;
And My people shall nevermore be put to shame.

Trimeter or tetrameter lines.

26^{b}, 27. V. ^{26b} = v. ^{27b}. This renewed material prosperity, so the editor adds, in well-known, common terms, will assure the people of Yahweh's protecting and helping presence among them. "Rain and harvest are not merely physical benefits, but religious sacraments: signs that God has returned to His people, and that His zeal is again stirred on their behalf" (GASm.). *And you shall know* (by this wonderful fertility) *that I am in the midst of Israel*, *cf.* Ex. 17^{7} Nu. 11^{20} 14^{14} Dt. 7^{21} Is. 12^{6}, etc. This is the first occurrence of *Israel* in the book, it is used as the postexilic name for Judah. *And* (further ye shall know that) *I Yahweh am your God and* (*that there is*) *none else.* These two phrases express profound convictions which thrilled the hearts of exilic and postexilic prophets: the blending together of the two elements of Yahweh's unity, monotheism, and of His particularly intimate relationship to Israel, as in a special manner Israel's God. For this blending and fusing into a higher unity Deutero-Isaiah is responsible. It belongs to the core of his teaching. Here in Joel the phrases do not have that real, vital significance, but sound purely liturgical. No trace of idolatry appears in the book. Joel's answer to the taunt of the heathen is given in v. ^{19}. The editor connects, of course, his statement with this, as the following shows, *and My people shall never more be put to shame.* Note the emphasis on the pronouns *My people, your God.*

15–17. The tenses are to be changed to the narrative tense, because these verses do not contain an exhortation but a description of the result of the sermon.—**16.** Siev. om., perhaps rightly, the second אספו mtr. cs. —חדר here parall. and synonymous with חֻפָּה *bridal-chamber*, *cf.* Ju. 15^{1} ψ 19^{6}. Some mss. point מחֲדרו.—**17.** For יבכו one Heb. codex reads יְכַסוּ. If the impf. is taken as expressing inchoative or continued action in the past, יבכו need not be changed to בכו. But, if necessary, it is not difficult to assume that the editor changed בכו to יבכו in conformity with his interpretation of vv. $^{16-17}$. חוּסָה with עַל, *cf.* Ne. 13^{22} Jon. 4^{11}. For למשל בם גוים read לְמָשָׁל בַּגּוֹיִם *a by-word among the nations.* 𝔐 which means *that the nations should rule over them*, AV., RV., is excluded by the context. No foreign nations have been mentioned as ruling over Judah. Not a devastation by enemies but by the locust plague has been the theme. The parall. ואל תתן נחלתך לחרפה and ולא אתן עוד חרפה בגוים in v. ^{19}, *cf.* also v. ^{27}, show that the nations taunt, but do not rule over, Judah. The vb. מָשַׁל, *to make proverbs of, using their name as a by-word, cf.* AVm., RVm., is, however, excluded here, because משל with ב means always either *to rule over*, or *to mock in* or *among*, ב *locale, cf.* Ez. 18^{3} 12^{23}. For the reading משל as a *noun*, above proposed, *cf.* Je. 24^{9}, לחרפה וּלְמָשָׁל. Either the day of Yahweh interpolator or a reader, under the influence of ch. 4 and of an allegorical interpretation of the locusts, corrected the text so that it read *that the nations should not rule over them.* —**18.** 𝔐 points correctly the impfs. with waw *consecutive*. Some have thought that the impfs. should be read with waw *conjunctive*, and that this verse and the foll. refer to the fut., containing prediction and promise. So, *e. g.*, Θ, AE., Ki., AV., etc., also Me., who regards the verses as a continuation of the prayer of the priests. They pray that Yahweh may answer and give to them all the beautiful promises which they put into his mouth. This is altogether improbable.—וַיְקַנֵּא is entirely correct and regular on our interpretation. If v. ^{18} were the beginning of the narrative the ו *consecutive* with impf. would have to be explained as one of the few instances where there is nothing in the preceding with which it is connected. It would be a sort of crystallised form for the introduction of a narrative, *cf.* Jon. 1^{1}.—**19.** לְעַמּוֹ, Ki.: ענה לצועקים על ידי נביאיו. —שֹׁלֵחַ prtc. of imminent fut.—Note the interpretative addition in some mss. חרפת רעב *shame of famine;* one ms. חרפה רעב shows the explanatory character of the gloss. 𝔗 also חיסורי כפנא. *Cf.* Ez. 36^{27}.—**20.** הצפוני *the northerner.* The term must refer to the locusts, for the fate described is that of a swarm of locusts and not of human armies. The interpretation of human invaders from the N., *e. g.*, the Assyrians, is excluded by the context. If original, the term designates the locusts as coming from the N., which is not the direction from which they usually come. That they may, however, come from there is certain for swarms were seen by Niebuhr between Mosul and Nisibis, by Thomson at Beirut, by John P. Peters west of Mosul, on the Tigris. The rareness may have suggested the term. But is such a designation not rather strange? Hi., Ew. explain הצפוני, therefore, as = ὁ τυφωνικός, Ex. 14^{2}, Acts 27^{14} Rev. 9$^{1-3}$, the locust swarm is a demoniacal scourge. *Cf.* for this use of τυφωνικός, *e. g.*, the prophecy of the Egyptian potter to King Amenophis, col. 2, l. 14, Gressmann, *Texte und Bilder zum A. T.*, p. 208. Somewhat differently most modern scholars believe that הצפוני, which was first used by Jeremiah of the northern hosts of the Scythians and Babylonians, had become a typical name for doom and as such might have different meanings in accordance with the special need; here the terrible locust swarm is called thus. But this does not suit the mode of the speech of Joel so well as that of the interpolator who saw in the locusts the precursors of the Day of Yahweh, and who evidently took הצפוני in the eschatological or apocalyptic sense, *cf.* also his understanding of v. [17]. There is thus some justification for the apocalyptic interpretation, but not for Joel himself. With true insight Roth. regards v. [20] as due to the editor who joined both sections together, WRS., *EB.*, 2496, as the addition of an allegorising glossator. But it is not necessary to regard the whole verse as secondary. The interpolator may be responsible only for הצפוני. E. Meier suggested as the original צְבָאִי or הַצָּבָא; Ew. הַצִּפּוֹנִי *der Heeresmann* √ צף Ar. = battle-line; Gr. חֹצֵץ הַגּוֹבַי, *agmen locustarum;* Che., *EB.*, 2496 n., וְאֶת־סופו וְאֶת־פָּנָיו *and both its rear and its van*, transposing v. [25] before v. [20]. Joel wrote simply a term for the locust plague.—We should be inclined to think that the apocalytic interpretation of the locusts appears also in 𝔊 of Am. 7[1] *καὶ ἰδοὺ βροῦχος εἷς Γώγ ὁ βασιλεύς*, if the Gk. translators inspired more confidence in their ability than they do. It may be that they did not reflect too much on a translation of a corrupt or illegible text, 𝔊 read והנה ילק אחר גוג המלך, 𝔐 והנה לקש אחר גזי המלך.—ושממה 𝔊 *ἀφανιῶ* = שִׁמַּמְתִּי, the following את was connected with it in Heb. text of 𝔊; one cod. ושמתיו.—ספו is a late word in Heb. literature, occurring only in Chronicles, Ecclesiastes, Daniel besides. It is really Aram. צחנתו nowhere else used in Heb. Bible, *cf.*, however, עָפר צחנה, Ecclus. 11[12], a synonym of באש, *cf.* BDB. The tautology of the clauses ועלה באשו and ותעל צחנתו seems to show that one of them is secondary. ועלה באשו is the common expression, Am. 4[10] Is. 34[3], and is therefore om. by Me., GASm., Dr., Marti, *et al.*, as a gloss on the unusual צחנתו. But the tense of ותעל, juss. with waw conj., is against the genuineness of ותעל צחנתו, We., van H. Surely, באש needed no explanatory gloss, but did צחנה which was well known in later times need it? Is it not more likely that the whole difficulty is to be solved by regarding ותעל as a corruption, say of יַעֲבֹר, *cf.* Ez. 8[11]? The rhythm favours this also.—In כי הגדיל לעשות the subj. must be the locusts. But this is difficult, since the phrase when used in contradistinction to God expresses arrogance, overweening pride. One can hardly speak of the locusts as animated by haughty disregard of Yahweh's commands. The phrase occurs almost immediately afterward with Yahweh in the sense of doing great and wonderful things. It is not likely that it would have the two different meanings in such close conjunction. We should therefore read אַגְדִּיל for הגדיל, since Yahweh is still speaking. Many take the clause as a doublet of v. [21b] and omit it. But it seems that it suggested the place where the lyrical poem, vv. [21-24], should be inserted, and belonged to the text in the emended form. The editor who inserted the day of Yahweh passages and interpreted הצפוני of human invaders was probably the one who changed the reading here also, interpreting our clause of the overweening haughtiness with which Yahweh's agents overstepped the limits of their authority.—**21.** Siev. reads וְאַתְּ for אל־תראי.—**22.** נשׂא פרי also Ez. 13^{8} 36^{3}, נשא with פרי understood, Hg. 2^{17}. The parall. expressions עשה פרי and נתן פרי were used at all times. חילם *their strength* = *their fruit*, Marti: *soviel sie tragen können.*—**23.** Siev. inserts וְאַתֶּם at the beginning.—The transl. of המורה לצדקה = *the teacher of righteousness*, 𝔗 Σ 𝔙, is excluded by the context, and with it all the various interpretations of this teacher as the Messiah, or the prophets, or Joel, or any other person, *e. g.*, Hezekiah. If the Messiah had been meant this would hardly have been said so incidentally. המורה must be = הַיּוֹרֶה. In the second line it is obvious that מוֹרֶה should be יוֹרֶה as 34 mss. read, the מ is due to dittog. The form מוֹרֶה occurs again, Ps. 84^{7}, but if the former rain is actually meant here we should read also in the first instance היּוֹרֶה. 𝔊's translation *βρώματα*, also 𝔖's, however, suggest that they read probably הַבִּרְיָה, 2 S. 13^{5} Ps. 69^{22} (Vol.), or הַמָּזוֹן, 2 Ch. 11^{23} (Me.). Hilgenfeld thought of מוֹתָר *abundance*, but the other suggestions are better. Since יוֹרֶה occurs again in the foll. line we do not expect it here and the reading of 𝔊 is almost certainly orig.—The meaning of לצדקה is also debated. Those who translate המורה by *teacher* take it as *the teacher in righteousness*, or, *in order to make the people righteous.* Those who translate המורה by *early rain*, or who read *food*, take לצדקה either as *moderately* AV., *in just measure* RV., *et al.*, *in normal measure* GASm., *for prosperity* BDB.; or *for righteousness* or *justification*, Ew., We., Dav., Now., Marti. צדקה is used only in a moral or religious sense. Dr. somewhat differently, "as His righteousness prompts Him to give it." Gr. בצדקה.—In regard to the second מורה it may be noted that the Talmud in quoting our passage reads יורה ומלקוש, *Taanith* 5b, 6b, *Shekalim* 6^{2}, *Sifre, ad* Dt. 11^{14}. Van H. points it מַרְוֶה, *l'ondée qui arrose.*

25. Gr. adds תְּבוּאַת before השנים. The expression *eat years* is strange. Moreover, this is the only passage which regards the visitation as extending over several years. Probably we should emend and read הַשְּׁמַנִּים *the fat, rich fruits* or *products*, *cf.* Gn. 27^{28}. This would be beautifully continued in v. ^{26}.—Siev. om. הילק והחסיל והגזם as an interpolation from 1^{4}.—שלחתי, one cod. נתתי.—חילי הגדול appears to be an insertion by the editor, *cf.* 2^{11}.—**26.** חלל, ancient word, *cf.* חִלּוּלִים, Ju. 9^{27}.—Me., We., Gr., *et al.*, om. v. ^{26b}.—**27.** Several Gk. mss. and 𝔊$^{\text{Ald.}}$ om. the whole verse. 𝔊^{153} om. v. ^{27b}.—Gr. adds after עוד either בלתי or זולתי, with 𝔊 𝔖, but *cf.* Is. 45^{18}. Me. adds עוד after יבושו, with 𝔊.

Chs. 3, 4 (Engl. 2^{28-32} 3) deal with an entirely different subject, the day of Yahweh, and make the impression of having been originally altogether unrelated with chs. 1, 2. They are now connected with them by a series of interpolations. It is likely, but not certain, that the nucleus of chs. 3, 4 comes from Joel and that the editor who inserted the interpolations concerning the day of Yahweh in chs. 1, 2 made a number of additions in chs. 3, 4 also. See p. 51 *ff*.

THE SIGNS OF THE DAY OF YAHWEH, 3^{1-5} (ENGL. 2^{28-32}).

Under the terrible impression of the approach of the day of judgment a great excitement will take hold of all the people, old and young, male and female, high and low, and it will manifest itself in all kinds of ecstatic experiences, vv. $^{1.\ 2}$. *Accompanying this excitement among men will be great disturbances in the sky and on earth, where extraordinary portents of the day will appear, vv.* $^{3.\ 4a}$.

The editor added the explanatory clause, v. ^{4b}, *before the day of Yahweh comes, the great and terrible one*, and then emphasised, on the authority of former prophecies, that every true worshipper of Yahweh would be delivered on this awful day, v. ^{5}.

1. (28) [*And it shall come to pass afterward that*]
I will pour out My Spirit upon all flesh,
and your sons and your daughters shall be entranced,
Your old men shall dream dreams,
and your young men shall see visions,
2. (29) And even upon your male and female slaves
will I pour out My Spirit [*in those days*].

3. (30) And I will show portents in heaven and on earth,
blood and fire and columns of smoke.
4. (31) The sun shall be turned into darkness,
and the moon into blood!
[*Before the day of Yahweh comes,*
the great and the terrible.]

5. (32) [*And it shall be that every one who calls*
on the name of Yahweh shall be saved,
For "in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be those that escape"
as Yahweh has said,
And (indeed), among the fugitives (shall be every one) whom Yahweh
calls.]

Three strs., (1) without secondary material, consists of two hexameters + a pentameter, (2) of two tetrameters + a pentameter + an editorial pentameter, (3) secondary, of two hexameters + a trimeter.

1. The editor connected ch. 1 and ch. 3 by the phrase *And it shall come to pass afterward*, he does not tell whether in the near or distant future, *I will pour out My Spirit upon all flesh.* The term *pour out My Spirit* appears to mark the abundance of the gift; it is used several times, Is. 32^{15} Ez. 39^{29}, as if the Spirit were a kind of fluid. Compare the instructive passage in 4 Ezr. $14^{38\text{ ff.}}$ where Ezra drinks the cup of inspiration "which was filled as with water whose colour was like fire," and is gifted as a result of this draught with insight, wisdom and memory. The effect of the outpouring of the Spirit which is described directly makes it clear that it is not a moral transformation of the people, not the renewal of their inner life, nor a deeper and more intimate knowledge of God such as heretofore had been enjoyed only by the prophets and which would now be the property of all, but the experience on the part of all, old and young, male and female, high and low, of those ecstatic spiritual states which had always been regarded as caused by a, or the, Spirit of God. *Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy*, or *speak with tongues;* prophesy does not represent exactly the meaning of the Heb. here, they will be in an ecstatic state and act as persons who are possessed by the Spirit, *and your old men shall dream dreams and your young men shall see visions.* Dreams and visions are frequently referred to as means of divine revelation, *e. g.*, Nu. 12^6. The assignment of the various forms to the various ages is rhetorical, and not due to the special appropriateness of dreams for old men and of visions for young men. If we were to explain the words with prosaic literalness we should have to inquire why the old women are left out, and why the young men are mentioned twice, for they are also included among the sons whose age is not specified here. The Heb. term for young men, used here, refers to those who are old enough to go to war, Je. 11^{22} 18^{21}. The content of the prophesyings and dreams and visions can only be the coming of the day of Yahweh. It is the tremendous excitement which takes hold of people under the stress of the terrible fear of the approach of a great catastrophe that makes them ecstatic. Here it is the most awful of days that approaches and everybody is seized by the presentiment which is usually experienced only by persons of a special nervous organisation. Yahweh will pour His Spirit upon *all flesh*. *All flesh* may mean all mankind, and we should interpret it thus, if the following context did not restrict it to the Jews, *cf.* also Is. 66^{23}. *All flesh* comes to mean simply *everybody*, as the French *tout le monde*. "But within Joel's Israel the operation of the Spirit was to be at once thorough and universal" (GASm.).—**2.** Even the slaves will not be excepted, and here again female as well as male are included. The author is very specific, he means everybody. That the noble and free are included goes without saying, but that the women and the slaves, even female slaves, will also be possessed by the Spirit is significant. It marks the universal character of the excitement. Though such possession by the Spirit is regarded as a high honour nothing is said or implied here of the moral power of the Spirit of God which transforms men and lives in them as an abiding presence. We must not, under the influence of Nu. 11^{29} Je. 24^{7} $31^{33\text{ f.}}$ 32^{29} Ez. $36^{26\text{ f.}}$ 39^{29} Is. 54^{13}, read into this passage that the Spirit will impart to all a full and complete knowledge of God so that they will all be as inspired with moral and religious truth as the prophets had been. In that side of the Spirit's work our writer is not interested here, to him these spiritual manifestations of ecstatic character are a sign of the approaching day of Yahweh.

3. *And I will show* (lit. give) *portents in heaven and on earth*, extraordinary phenomena which by their strange and striking character will make a profound impression. *Blood and fire and columns of smoke* refer most naturally to the portents on earth, since v. ^{31} speaks of those in heaven. There will be terrible wars with their bloody massacres and the burning of cities, *cf.* Ez. 38[22] Mk. 13[7 f.] Mt. 24[6].*—**4.** As portents in heaven *the sun will turn itself into darkness, and the moon into blood, cf.* 2[10] 4[15] Rev. 20[11]. In antiquity eclipses of the sun and blood-red appearances of the moon, due to atmospheric conditions, always caused much fear, Ez. 32[7 f.], Rev. 6[12]. They were inexplicable and therefore awe-inspiring, foreboding something unusual, Am. 8[9], as indeed every extraordinary phenomenon in the sky or on earth did.† Here they are impressive portents of the coming judgment-day, Is. 13[10] 34[4] Mt. 24[29].

The clause *before the great and terrible day of Yahweh comes* is the same as in Mal. 3[25] (Engl. 4[5]). It is added here by the editor, for Yahweh's speech ends with v. [4a]. The awe and terror which from Amos on had been associated with the day is reflected here. The judgment according to prophetic teaching should begin with the Jews for whom it will be great and terrible also. But our author does not mention the punishment or purgation of Israel. His interest is rather in the deliverance of the Jews, which is contrasted in ch. 4 (Engl. 3) with the destruction of the heathen.—**5.** Nevertheless Israel's purgation is implied, for he continues *and it shall come to pass that every one who calls on the name of Yahweh shall be delivered*, that is not every Jew simply because he is a Jew, but every God-fearing Jew who trusts in Yahweh and calls on Him for help. Note the complement in v. [5] *whom Yahweh calls* and thereby recognises as His true worshipper. The others shall, of course,—this is implied,—not escape. This promise of the deliverance of a remnant had often been made before, and it is on the authority of an older oracle that the editor makes it here, fortifying his words not by a reference to his own inspiration but by a literal quotation from an older prophet, Ob. [17], *for "in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem there shall be those that escape"*

---

* Dr. thinks that the columns of smoke more probably allude to "columns of sand and dust raised high in the air by local whirlwinds accompanying a sirocco, which sometimes 'march with great rapidity over the open plain, and closely resemble pillars of smoke' (Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, Southern Pal., p. 142)." Others think of volcanic outbreaks.

† Cred. cites Ovid, *Met.*, XV, 782 *ff.*; Cicero, *De nat. deor.*, 2, 3 *ff.*; *De leg.*, 2, 13; 3, 12, 19, etc., and esp. *De divinatione*; Vergil, *Ecl.*, 1, 16 *ff.*; *Georg.*, 1, 464 *ff.*; Lucan., *Phars.*, 1, 524 *ff.*; Livy, 22, 1; Josephus, *BJ.*, 1, 7, 12; and other parallels from oriental and germanic sources.

(lit. an escape), *as Yahweh has said, sc.* in Ob. [17]. And these fortunate ones he defines once more, *and* (= German *und zwar*) *among the fugitives*, who shall escape the judgment, shall be every one *whom Yahweh calls* and thus proclaims as belonging to the saved ones. Is. 4^3 defines them slightly differently as *every one that is written for life in Jerusalem.* The sentence *and among the fugitives* (*shall be every one*) *whom Yahweh calls* is parallel to *every one who calls on the name of Yahweh shall be delivered.* It does not mean that others in addition to those already mentioned shall be saved, namely the Jews in the Dispersion who will be called to Jerusalem, for it is not said that those first mentioned are already in Jerusalem. That the loyal Jews of the Dispersion are included among the true Yahweh worshippers is obvious. And though it is not directly stated it may be gathered from the editor's words combined with those of the quotation that they will all be summoned to Zion. The passage speaks only of Jews, not of men in general, but its phrases *all flesh*, v. [1], *every one who calls on the name of Yahweh, whom Yahweh calls*, v. [5], have a universal ring and could later on, when the context was disregarded, be interpreted without much difficulty in a universalistic manner, *cf.* Rom. 10^{13}. But our authors would have been much astonished over such an interpretation, *cf.* the astonishment in Acts 10^{45}.

This chapter, with the exception of v. [5b], was quoted by Peter in his speech on Pentecost, Acts 2^{17-21}, in which the outpouring of the Spirit on that day was interpreted as the fulfilment of this prophecy. Joel has, as a result of this, been called the Prophet of Pentecost. But he did not predict the event of Pentecost nor "the new order of things of which Pentecost was the first example" (Dav.). He did not predict the enjoyment of the fuller illumination on the part of all, which had been the prerogative of the prophets and the hope of Nu. 11^{29} and Je. $31^{33\,f.}$ and which later became the ideal of the Christian church. The reason why his words have ever again seemed to students to contain just this lies partly in the general terms which he used and partly in that he did not state the content of those ecstatic and prophetic experiences. In the context they are connected with the approach of the terrible judgment-day.

But usually their context has been defined in the light of Nu. 11^{29} Je. $31^{33\text{ f.}}$ Acts $2^{14\text{ ff.}}$ rather than of the context.* It is instructive to note that the author of the Acts disregarded the other elements of the prediction, being solely intent on the outpouring of the Spirit of which Jo. 3 had spoken.

1. את־רוחי 𝔊 *ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος*, also v. ^{2}, not all but part of the spirit.—On נבא, *cf.* Bewer, *AJSL.*, 1902, p. 120.—Che., *CB.*, II, p. 130, reads על־כל־בית־ישראל for על־כל־בשר.—**2.** העבדים 𝔊 *τοὺς δούλους μοῦ*, so also 𝔙, but wrongly, for this would refer to the Jews in their relation to Yahweh, not to slaves in their relation to their masters. But a further step is indicated by וְגַם.—**4.** יהפך Ni., reflexive here, more poetic than the pass. would be, *cf.* אספו, 2^{10}. Now.^{K} is inclined to regard הגדול והנורא as secondary, but probably the whole clause is an editorial addition.—**5.** אשר יקרא Gr. אֲשֶׁר יִקְרָא. ובשרידיכ 𝔊^{BAY} *καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενοι οὓς κύριος προσκέκληται*, Aq. Θ *καὶ ἐν τοῖς καταλελειμμένοις οὓς κύριος καλέσει.* 𝔊 =וּמְבַשְּׂרִים. Aq. Θ = 𝔐. Gr. וְלַחֲרֵדִים, Is. 66^5, Siev. לַשְּׂרִידִים. Grammatically ובשרדים is taken by some as parall. to בהר ציון, and תהיה פליטה is supplied in thought, *on Mount Zion . . . shall be those who escape . . . and among the fugitives whom Yahweh calls.* But this constr. overlooks that ובשרידים is no longer part of the quotation.

The author of Acts quoted from 𝔊 not from the Heb., as *ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου*, vv. $^{17.\ 18}$, *καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι*, v. ^{18}, *δούλους μοῦ*, v. ^{18}, *ἐπιφανῆ*, v. ^{20}, clearly show. *Ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις*, v. ^{17}, for *μετὰ ταῦτα*, v. ^{1}, and the additions *καὶ προφητεύσουσιν*, v. ^{18}, *ἄνω, σημεῖα, κάτω*, v. ^{19}, appear to be due to free quotation, as does also the transposition of the sentences concerning the old men and the young men.

ANNOUNCEMENT AND REASON OF THE JUDGMENT ON ALL THE NATIONS, $4^{1\text{-}3}$ (ENGL. $3^{1\text{-}3}$).

At the time of the restoration of Judah Yahweh will gather all nations in the valley of Jehoshaphat to judge them for the wrongs done by them to His people.

$^{1\cdot}$ [*For behold in those days and at that time,*
when I restore the fortune of Judah and Jerusalem,]

---

* See on $3^{1\text{-}5}$ Giesebrecht, *Die Berufsbegabung der Alttestamentlichen Propheten*, 1897, p. 152 *f.* and esp. Volz, *Der Geist Gottes und die verwandten Erscheinungen im Alten Testament und im anschliessenden Judentum*, 1910, pp. 91 *ff.*

[2] Then I will gather all nations,
  and bring them down to Jehoshaphat's valley.
And I will enter into judgment with them there,

[Because of My people and My heritage Israel,
Whom they have scattered among the nations,
  and they divided My land,
And cast lots over My people,
  and gave a boy for (the use of) a harlot,
And sold a girl for wine and drank it.]

Two introductory, editorial pentameters are followed by an original hexameter + a trimeter. The remainder consists of a trimeter + a pentameter + a hexameter + a tetrameter.

1. This is the editor's connecting link. To him the judgment of the nations is the complement of the deliverance of Judah. As so often Yahweh, who speaks Himself, calls attention to the importance of his announcement by *behold!* In those days, the same phrase occurs in 3^2, *and in that time*, cp. for the combination of these phrases, Je. 33^{15} $50^{4.20}$, *when I restore the fortune of Judah and Jerusalem.* This defines the time more closely but not in the same manner as ch. 3. There the escape of the true Israelites is described, here the restoration of the fortune of Judah. The term involves a decisive change for the better. The turn of Judah's fortune had not come. This does not mean that this writer lived in the Babylonian exile, for even after the exile the conditions were such that the Jews could not believe that Yahweh had come back to them, *cf.* Haggai and Zechariah. It is noteworthy that only Judah and Jerusalem are mentioned, N. Israel had perished long ago. V. ^{1} would be unnecessary, if v. ^{2} still followed directly upon the words of Yahweh in 3^{1-4}.—**2.** *I will gather all nations*, not only the one or the other but all, all heathendom, *cf.* Ez. 38 *f.* Zp. 3^8, *and will bring them down into the valley of Jehoshaphat.* The term *Jehoshaphat* means *Yahweh judges* or *has judged*, and is used here symbolically of the place of which Yahweh says, *and I will contend there in judgment with them.* Yahweh's judgment valley is called *the valley of decision* in v. ^{14}, because His decision on the nations will be executed there. These are legal terms, *cf.* Je. 2^{35} 25^{31} Ez. 38^{22}, the case is carried through to a final judgment. Yahweh disputes, argues and decides His case against the nations. Our writer evidently thought of the valley as situated near Jerusalem, *cf.* v.^{16}. Ever since Ezekiel had predicted the attack upon Jerusalem by united heathendom and its judgment before the Holy City, the Jews believed this, Ez. 38 *f.* Zc. 9$^{14\text{ ff.}}$ 12$^{1-9.}$ Dn. 11^{45}. This makes it certain that our author did not have in mind the valley of *Berakhah* which was connected with King Jehoshaphat's victory over the Moabites, Ammonites and Meunites, 2 Ch. 20$^{20-28}$. Not only its name but also the distance is against it. That there was a valley near Jerusalem named after King Jehoshaphat in ancient times is unknown and improbable. The Kidron valley which bears the name valley of Jehoshaphat now and did so in the time of Eusebius received it on the basis of our passage rather than on any other ground. Whether, however, our author identified the Kidron valley with the valley of Jehoshaphat we do not know. The old identification with Gehinnom* has much to commend itself in view of Je. 7$^{32\text{ f.}}$ 31^{40}. Both belong together as scenes of judgment. But unfortunately the location of the ravine of Hinnom is much debated, and the Heb. term for *valley*, *ʿēmeḳ*, used here, denotes a wide depression between mountains, not a narrow gorge or ravine as the term *gai'* in connection with Hinnom does. For the gathering of all the nations a wide, capacious valley was needed. There is no doubt that the author of Zc. 14 regarded the Kidron valley and the adjoining widening mountain basin in the S. of the city where the three valleys met as the scene of the judgment. That he depends on earlier tradition is apparent, and that this was our passage is virtually certain though he does not mention the name, valley of Jehoshaphat. This is not strange, since that name is merely a rhetorical device.—The reason for the judgment is not the moral iniquity of the nations, general or specific, or idolatry, but their attitude toward Israel, *on account of My people and My heritage*, *cf.* 2^{17}, *Israel whom they dispersed among the nations.* Israel is here the name of the people of Yahweh as such, and does not mean N. Israel but Judah, *cf.* v.^{1}. The words presuppose an important dispersion and get their true significance only by reference to the Babylonian exile and the dispersion that followed it, *cf.* Ez. 11^{17} 12^{15} $20^{34.\,41}$ 22^{15} 28^{25} 36^{19}. Whether also the north Israelitish dispersion is included, we cannot tell, but it is likely. The capture of Jerusalem in 586 B.C. is implied in the following. *And they divided my land* among new occupants, as victors do with conquered territory. This may include a reference to the occupation of parts of the country by the neighbouring nations, Ammon, Edom, Philistia after 586 B.C. as well as to the settling of colonists in N. Israel after 722 B.C. The invasion of the Philistines and Arabs under Jehoram, 2 Ch. $21^{16\,\text{f.}}$, with which some have identified these sentences, is excluded by the strong terms which demand the reference to 586 B.C.—**3.** More details are given of the behaviour of the enemies toward Yahweh's people at this time. *And they cast lots over my people*, *cf.* Ob. ^{11} Na. 3^{10}, dividing the captives of war by lot among themselves in accordance with ancient custom in warfare. And they had so many of them and esteemed them so little that *they gave a boy* as price *for* the use of *a harlot*. Though the text may also be translated *they gave a boy for*, in exchange for, *a harlot*, the following shows that they did not intend to keep but only to use them for the momentary gratification of their sensual passion. *And they sold a girl for wine and drank* it at once in their reckless revellings. What a contemptuous treatment of Yahweh's own people! These lines give us a vivid touch of those awful scenes after the capture of Jerusalem. It is the usual picture of the behaviour of victorious soldiers with their revelry and debauch after the conquest. Merchants and slave-traders followed the army or were sometimes even asked to come and buy the captives, as in 1 Mac. 3^{41}. And the prices paid were high or low in proportion to the number. Nicanor offered ninety captives for one talent, 2 Mac. 8^{11}, Josephus, *Ant.*, XII, 7, 3. At Hebron four Jews were sold for a *modius* of barley in the Jewish war under Hadrian, Glyc., *Ann.*, III, 448.—It will be observed that the writer gives as the reason for the judgment on all the nations only their treatment of Israel. Now not all nations had acted in the described manner toward Israel. Assyria had done so in 722 B.C., Babylonia in 586 B.C., but not the other nations. There is no hint that Assyria and Babylonia are thought of here as representatives of heathendom. Most probably vv. [2b. 3] come from the editor.

---

* Eusebius, *Onomasticon*, ed. Lagarde, p. 300, φάραγξ Ἐννόμ . . . παράκειται δὲ τῇ Ἱερουσαλὴμ λέγεται δὲ εἰς ἔτι νῦν φάραγξ Ἰωσαφάτ.

1. 𝔊 adds ἐγώ after הנה. Gr. suggests אַחֲרֵי for אשר, several codd. om.—Kt. אשוב, Q. אשיב. The phrase השיב(שוב) את שבית means either *to bring back the captives* or *to make a restoration, to restore the fortune of.* שבית is derived either from שבה or from שוב. The strongest argument for the latter is the use of the phrase in connections where the captivity is not alluded to. But while not impossible, it is not so likely that שבית came from שוב. The phrase becomes frequent from the time of Jeremiah on. And it would seem that it had first to do with *captivity* √ שבה, and then became a general phrase in proph. usage for restoring the fortunes of somebody.—**2.** Siev. om. והורדתים. עמק, in contrast to a narrow gorge or ravine גי, denotes a wider, more spacious *deepening* between mountains. Θ transl. אל עמק יהושפט, *εἰς τὴν χῶραν τῆς κρίσεως*. Che., *CB.*, emends עמק יהושפט to מַעֲכַת צָפַּת *the Zarephathite Maacath* (in contrast to a northern Maacath). Note the word play in ונשפטתי on יהושפט. 𝔊 points פֻּזְּרוּ Pu., *διεσπάρησαν*.—**3.** אל for על, Ob. [11].—ידו Gr. יָרוּ, *cf.* on Ob. [11].—For בזונה Me., Gr., *et al.*, read בַּמָּזוֹן or בַּמְּזוּנָה, 𝔐 is preferable.

SPECIAL ORACLE AGAINST THE PHŒNICIANS AND PHILISTINES, 4^{4-8} (ENGL. 3^{4-8}).

These verses are not merely a digression but a later insertion by a writer who probably interpreted vv. [2. 3] as referring to the Persians under Artaxerxes Ochus, *c.* 352 B.C. He added them here because the behaviour of the Phœnicians and Philistines at that time called for special condemnation. They were the slave-traders and merchants to whom the Persian soldiers had sold their captives and their booty.

4. *Moreover, what did* YOU *want of me, Tyre and Sidon,*
and all the districts of Philistia?
Were you trying to repay Me for something I had done,
or were you intending to do something to Me (which will call forth requital on My part)?

Swiftly, speedily will I return your deed on your own head,
5. *(On you) who have taken My silver and My gold,*
and have brought my costly jewels into your palaces,
6. *And have sold the Judeans and the Jerusalemites to the Greeks.*
In order to remove them (as) far (as possible) from their home.

[7]. *Behold, I am about to stir them up from the place*
whither you have sold them,
And I will return your deed upon your head,
[8]. *and I will sell your sons and your daughters*
Into the hand of the Judeans,
and they shall sell them to the Sabeans for a distant people,
For Yahweh has spoken (it).

Three strs., (1) consists of two heptameters, (2) of a tetrameter + two heptameters + a tetrameter, (3) of three heptameters. *For Yahweh has spoken* does not belong to the strophic scheme. While certain lines in this whole section are rhythmic, the paragraph as a whole is prosaic and as such sharply differentiated from its context.

4. *And moreover*, in addition to the others, *what do* YOU *want of me?* Yahweh identifies Himself with His people so that whatever is done to Israel is done to Him, and whatever Israel has done is regarded as having been done by Him. Thus the question really means, was what you did to Israel an act of revenge for some wrong that Israel had done, or was it a wanton, gratuitous movement on your part unprovoked by Israel? It is a rhetorical question, for at once He adds, *speedily, swiftly I will return your deed upon your own head*, *cf.* Ob. [15] Ps. 7^{17}. They had already done their deed, which is specified.—**5.** *You have taken my silver and my gold and my finest valuables*, lit., desirable things, *i. e.*, jewels, ornaments, etc. By a community of interests the treasures of Israel belonged to Yahweh, who is here as in v. [4] identified with Israel. It is not, therefore, the plundering of the temple at Jerusalem that our author refers to,—he would have been more explicit in that case,—but the taking of the treasures of Israel which they brought home in order to enrich their palaces. The Heb. term for *palaces* may also mean *temples*, and a reference to gifts to the sanctuaries need not be excluded. The use of the phrase *ye have taken* instead of a stronger one may be intentional. It supports the view that the Phœnicians and Philistines were not the conquerors but the merchants who had come to profit by exchanging wares, selling wine, furnishing harlots, etc., for the spoil and the captives. The second charge is closely connected with the first.—**6.** *And the Judeans and the Jerusalemites ye have sold to the Greeks* as slaves. The Phœnicians and the Philistines were famous slave-traders in antiquity.* The Greeks are mentioned here not as the great world power but as traders; as such they had long been in intercourse with the Phœnicians and Philistines. Sold to the Greeks, the Jews were taken far from their home and thus practically for ever prevented from returning to their native land. This made their fate all the harder. The text represents this as purposed by their owners, *in order that ye might remove them far from their home*, lit., border, but this was certainly only incidental to them, their main motive was commercial. The Heb. often expresses the result by a purpose clause, as if it had been designed, *cf. e. g.*, Je. 27^{10}.—**7.** Now Yahweh announces the mode of their punishment. *Behold I am about to stir them up*, *i. e.*, the Jews who had been sold into slavery. He rouses them into activity so that they may make an effort to leave their slavery and return home. How this will be done, whether they will revolt against their masters, and what will happen to their masters we are not told. Historical agencies and probabilities our author does not consider. Yahweh will put this impulse into them to leave the places of their servitude, and He will, of course, enable them to accomplish it. Then Yahweh will avenge their wrongs upon the Phœnicians and Philistines.—**8.** And their fate will be the same as Israel's had been. They had sold the Jews into slavery to the Greeks in the NW., now the Jews will sell them into slavery to the Sabeans in the distant SE. A strict administration of the *lex talionis!* Yahweh in whose hand are the destinies of all the nations will deliver their sons and the daughters into the power of the Jews, lit., *sell them into the hand of the Jews*, by a victory or in some other way. The Jews will sell them into slavery to the Sabeans in S. Arabia, with whom they had been in commercial relations, *cf.* Je. 6^{20}. And the Sabeans will sell them to a still more distant nation. In former days the Edomites had acted as the middlemen, Am. $1^{6.\,9}$, now the Sabeans will do so. On the Sabeans, a wealthy and important commercial people in SW. Arabia, their own inscriptions furnish us with information. The interpolator concludes with the solemn formula *for Yahweh has spoken* (*it*), which marks the foregoing announcement as the purpose of Yahweh Himself and not merely the wish of the writer.

---

* *Cf.* Am. $1^{6.\,9}$ Ez. 27^{13} 1 Mac. 3^{41} 2 Mac. 8^{11}, also Homer, *Od.*, $14^{288\,\text{ff.}}$ $15^{402\,\text{ff.}}$, Herodotus, I, 1, II, 54. The Greeks were known among the Hebrews by the name *Yᶜwānīm*, Ionians, ’ΙάFονες in Homer, because "the Ionians (whose colonies extended over a large part of the W. coast of Asia Minor, and many of the Ægean islands) were most active commercially in ancient times, and hence were best known to other nations" (Dr.).

4. מה אתם לי *lit. what are ye to me?* which frequently means *what have ye to do with me?* AV., RV., but here as the foll. indicates, *what do you want of me?* or *what will ye do to me?* גלילות *the districts*, lit. *circles*, German *Bezirke*. 𝔊 Γαλιλαία, also Jos. 13^2 1 Mac. 5^{15} Aq. *θῖνες*, Σ *ὅρια*.—הגמול—ואם׳ a disjunctive question; 𝔙, Rosenm., Ew., van H. take ואם׳ as a conditional sentence. This is not impossible, but less natural and graphic.—גמל על׳ means *to do something to somebody* which calls forth a similar act on his part. It depends on the context whether it is a good or bad deed, here as in 2 Ch. 20^{11} it is used in a bad sense, in ψ 13^6 in a good sense. The same holds good of גמול. בראשכם, 𝔊 pl.—**5.** אשׁר is taken by 𝔊 𝔙 as a conjunctive particle.—להיכְלֵיכם, some mss. point להיכַלְכם, 3 mss. read ב׳ for ל׳. היכל from *ê-kallu* may mean either temple or palace, the Gk. mss. vary, most have *ναούς*, others *οἴκους*, 𝔊ᴬ *θησαύρους*. 𝔗 𝔖 retain היכל, 𝔙 *delubra*.—**6.** בני היונים is peculiar, we expect either בני יָוָן or simply היונים, but there are parall. in late literature for the use of the pl. of the gentilic word with בני instead of the sg., *cf.* Holz. The *Yᶜwānīm* were formerly often identified with a people in Arabia, so *e. g.*, among modern com. by Cred. הרחיקם 𝔊 *ἐξώσητε* = הריחם (?), *cf.* 2^{20} *ἐξώσω* הרחתי. The subj. of the inf. are the Phœnicians and Philistines.—**7.** מעירם, one cod. מעירם. The constr. is pregnant *I am about to arouse them* (prtc. of imminent future) into action so that they may leave the place where they are and return home.—**8.** מכר ביד lit. *to sell into the hand of*, means usually *to deliver into the power of*, and must mean this here also, though מכר (but without ביד!) in this section means *to sell*. 2 codd. read ונתתי, which is a correct interpretation, but not the orig. text.—לשבאים 𝔊 *εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν* = לַשְּׁבִי, so Me., Oort, *et al.* But 𝔐 is preferable because it is more striking. Aq. Σ Θ *τοῖς Σαβαειμ*. Ehr. suggests לשׁביהם *to them with whom they were in captivity*. We may compare Is. 14^2, but the thought is not quite the same. The change of the prepositions ל and אל in לשבאים אל גוי is noteworthy. Probably Scholz, Marti, Du. are right in translating *to the Sabeans for a distant nation*. This makes the Sabeans the middlemen in this slave traffic. It gives point to the words and explains also the omission of the art. in גוי רחוק.

PREPARATIONS OF THE NATIONS FOR THE FINAL CONFLICT OR JUDGMENT, 4[9-12] (ENGL. 3[9-12])

In vv.[2. 3] *Yahweh had announced His intention of gathering and judging all the nations in the valley of Jehoshaphat. In vv.* [9-12] *they are all summoned to arm themselves for a great battle and to march to the valley where it will be fought. The battle is a figure of Yahweh's judgment.*

9. Proclaim this among the nations:

Consecrate war,
  arouse the mighty men!
Let all the warriors
  approach and come on!

10. Beat your ploughshares into swords,
  and your pruning-hooks into lances!
Let the weakling say, I am strong!
11. let the coward become a hero!

12. For the nations shall be roused and march
  to Jehoshaphat's valley,
For there will I sit in judgment
  on all the nations from every quarter.

Three strs. with a prefatory trimeter. (1) consists of two tetrameters (staccato style), (2) of a pentameter + a hexameter, (3) of a pentameter + a hexameter.

9. Yahweh Himself speaks, see v. [12]. Whom He addresses is not stated and His command, *Proclaim this* (the following) *among the nations!* may be rhetorical for *let the following be proclaimed!* by heralds, of course, *cf.* Ob. [1], or it may be addressed to the agents of His judgment to whom He gives orders in v. [13]. *Sanctify*, or *consecrate, war!* is a characteristic term for getting ready for war by sacrifices and cultic observances, *cf.* 1 S. 7[8. 9] Je. 6[4] 51[27]. The soldiers are sometimes called *the consecrated ones*, Is. 13[3]. *Stir up*, arouse, *the mighty men!* "from the inactivity of peace" (Dr.). This as well as the foll. is still part of the summons which the heralds address to the nations, not to Israel, as many from early times on have believed. *Let all the warriors approach, let them come on!*

The style of this entire section is graphic. The brief, strong words of command, much briefer in Heb. than in Engl., are vivid and their rhythmic staccato movement is most effective.—**10.** The critical character of the war is emphasised, it is to be a war of terrible consequences. Therefore every possible armour is to be used, *Beat your ploughshares into swords, and your pruning-hooks into lances!* turn all your instruments of peace into weapons of war, for you will need all the weapons you can procure.* All available men will be needed for this crisis, *Let the weakling say I am strong!*—**11b.** *Let the coward become a hero!* The last part has been restored with the help of 𝕲. It stands now in v. ^{11b} and 𝕸 is usually translated (*Hither*) *cause Thy mighty ones to come down, O Yahweh!* (*cf.* AV., RV.), a text which is altogether out of place here.—**11a.** is a doublet of v. ^{12a} and not a part of the original text (*v. i.*).—**12.** *For* (*v. i.*) *the nations shall be roused and march to the valley of Jehoshaphat, for there will I sit down to judge all the nations from everywhere.* The figure of the battle is dropped and a legal term is used, the battle gives way to the judgment scene. Yahweh will sit on His throne, not full of anger and passion, as in Is. 3^{13}, but full of solemn majesty to give His judicial decision on the great judgment-day. The word usually translated *round about* means here *from all around, from every side, from everywhere,* as in Ez. $16^{33.\ 37}$ 23^{22} 37^{21} 39^{17}, for the judgment is not limited to the surrounding nations but is universal, *cf.* vv.$^{2.\ 9.\ 12a}$.

There is a lacuna after v. ^{12} which acts like a pause during which the nations have gathered themselves in the valley of judgment, for suddenly Yahweh's command rings out, addressed most probably to his angelic host and not to the Jews.

---

* *Cf.* Vergil, *Georg.*, I. 507 *f.*, *squalent abductis arva colonis, Et curvae rigidum falces conflantur in ensem.* Ovid, *Fast.*, I 699 *f.*, *sarcula cessabunt, versique in pila ligones, Factaque de rastri pondere cassis erat.* For the reverse of this in the golden era of peace, *cf.* Is. 2^4 (Mi. 4^3), also Martial, *Epigr.*, 14, 34, *Falx ex ense: Pax me certa dulcis placidos conflavit in usus, Agricolae nunc sum, militis ante fui.*

THE SIGNAL FOR THE ATTACK, 4^{13} (ENGL. 3^{13}).

Apply the pruning-knives!
  for the vintage is ripe.
Go in! tread!
  for the wine-press is full.
Empty the vats!
  for their overflow is great.

Three tetrameters (staccato style).

13. *Apply the pruning-knives, for the vintage is ripe! Go in* (into the wine-press), *tread* (the grapes), *for the wine-press is full! Empty the vats, for their overflow is great!* The executors of Yahweh's judgment are represented as vintagers who are to begin and complete the terrible harvest at once. The grapes are ripe, the wine-press is full, the vats overflow. No time is to be lost, everything is ready for the attack upon the nations and their destruction. —Usually the first sentence is translated, *Put in the sickle, for the harvest is ripe!* And this is entirely possible. We should then have two figures, the reaping of the grain harvest for the mowing down of the foes, *cf.* Is. 17^5, and the treading out of the grapes for trampling down the enemies and wading in their blood, *cf.* Is. 63^{1-3}. In Rev. 14^{14-20} both figures are used. But since one figure is poetically more effective here, the single comparison with the whole process of the vintage appears preferable. On vats and wine-presses see 2^{24}.—The last sentence is usually translated *the vats overflow, for their wickedness is great.* But a slight emendation saves the poetic quality of the verse (*v. i.*).

14–16. Now follows a brief description of the battle, characterised by a remarkable self-restraint. We hear the roar and thunder of the battle, but we see no fighting, as if a heavy cloud hung over the valley shutting out of view the scene. There is a lack of detail and of definiteness which creates a feeling of vagueness, not unsuited nor unimpressive. We might interpret this as due to the writer's shy regard and reverence which prevented him from describing minutely the battle between the heavenly and the earthly armies, if it were not rather due to his lack of original power. With the exception of v. ^{14a} the phrases are all taken from other prophetic writings. Only v. ^{14a} is from Joel., vv. $^{14b-16}$ are from the editor.

THE BATTLE, 4^{14-17} (ENGL. 3^{14-17}).

14. Multitudes roar
in the valley of decision!
[*For near is the day of Yahweh*
in the valley of decision.

15. *Sun and moon have grown dark,*
and the stars have withdrawn their splendour.
16. *And Yahweh roars from Zion,*
and thunders from Jerusalem,
And quaking are heaven and earth.—

But Yahweh is a refuge to His people,
and a stronghold to the Israelites.
17. *And ye shall know that I am Yahweh, your God,*
dwelling in Zion, My holy mountain.
And Jerusalem shall be inviolable,
and barbarians shall not set foot in her any more.]

Three strs., (1) consists of a tetrameter + a pentameter, (2) of two hexameters + a trimeter, (3) of a hexameter + two heptameters.

14. The din of the vast crowds is heard, *Multitudes roar* (𝔊) *in the valley of decision!* It is not merely the hum of a great throng, but the tremendous roar of the war cries and the noise of the battle in the valley where the final decision of Yahweh is rendered and which is therefore called the *valley of decision.* 𝔐 reads, *Multitudes, multitudes in the valley of decision!* an exclamation of surprise and terror by the prophet because he sees multitudes upon multitudes gathered there. If this is the original reading, the exclamation is not part of the description of the battle itself but of the preparations for it, and comes too late after the command of attack has been given in v. ^{13}. Similarly the explanation *because the day of Yahweh is at hand in the valley of decision* comes too late, because the day has actually begun, v. ^{13}. We might emend by changing the punctuation *because the battle of Yahweh is* (*going on*) *in the valley*, but the clause belongs more probably to the editor.—**15.** Darkness has settled on the scene, *the sun and the moon* *have grown dark and the stars have withdrawn their shining*, light. This makes the battle more gruesome. The same words occur in 2^{10}, where also the following sentences are found more or less literally.—**16a.** Above the din of the battle sounds Yahweh's terrible voice, *and Yahweh roars from Zion and thunders from Jerusalem.* This is *verbatim* = Am 1^{2}. Cp. 2^{11} where Yahweh thunders before His mighty army. He Himself does not appear or fight as in Zc. 14. He only utters His terrible judgment, *cf.* Is. 17^{13}, from Zion where He dwells and from where He can see the vast throng in the valley below. There is no real contradiction between this and v. ^{12b}. As He thunders *the heavens and the earth quake*, *cf.* 2^{10}, in terror of His awful majesty.—**16b.** *The protection of Israel.* In this awful judgment Israel will be safe, *and Yahweh is a refuge to His people and a stronghold to the Israelites.* *Cf.* Ps. 14^{6} 46^{1} 47^{1} 31^{4} 43^{2}. The outcome of the conflict is so obvious that the writer does not describe it, but Israel's safety he must emphasise as most important, *cf.* 3^{5} (Engl. 2^{32}).

17. Yahweh Himself speaks again, promising abiding safety to Jerusalem. The transition from v. ^{16} to v. ^{17} is abrupt, not in thought but in form, and the fact that Yahweh comments on the words of the prophet in v. ^{16} is remarkable. But it is the editor's manner, *cf.* 2^{27}. As a result of this defeat of the nations and of their own deliverance the Jews *shall know*, so He says, *that I am Yahweh your God*, *cf.* Ez. 38^{23} $39^{6.\ 7.\ 22.\ 28}$, bound to you by ties of close relationship and *dwelling* in your midst *on My holy mountain Zion*, *cf.* 2^{27} 4^{21} Is. 8^{18}, protecting you as now so for ever from all attacks of the nations. *And Jerusalem shall be a sanctuary*, inviolable, *cf.* Ob. ^{17} also Na. 1^{15} Is. 52^{1} Zc. 9^{8} 14^{21}. This means that *strangers*, enemies, barbarians, *shall not pass through her any more*, as they had done, *e. g.* in 586 B.C.

9. On preparations for war see Schwally, *Semitische Kriegsaltertümer*, pp. 1, 47.—For הָעִירוּ one cod. reads העיזו.—**10.** כֹּ.וּ., Is. 2^{4} Mi. 4^{3}: כִּתְּתוּ.—For רמחים, a word "with Aramaic affinities, and otherwise found chiefly either in North-Israelitish writings (Jud. V. 8 1 K. XVIII. 28), or in late authors" (Dr.), the parall. in Is. 2^{4} Mi. 4^{3} reads the usual חֲנִיתוֹת.—חַלָּשׁ intensive formation, as adj. or noun only here in OT., but usual in NH. The vb. occurs several times in OT.—**11.** שָׁמָּה

הַנְחַת יְהוָה גִּבּוֹרֶיךָ *thither lead down Thy heroes, O Yahweh!* This comes so abruptly that it can only be explained as the passionate interruption of the author (or a reader) who prayed that Yahweh would lead his angelic host down into the conflict. But it is not only abrupt but premature. The attempt to obviate the abruptness by translating, *there Yahweh shatters*, or *dismays*, *thy heroes!* (Cred., Gr., Scholz, deriving הנחת from חתת with 𝔗 𝔖 𝔙) is not successful because it still interrupts the address. Moreover, who is spoken to? The nations? Why is the sg. used then? (Gr. reads pl.). Why שמה and not שם? Marti, Siev., Du. regard the sentence as a gloss. But this does not seem likely esp. in view of 𝔊 which reads *ὁ πρᾳῢς ἔστω μαχητής* = הַנָּחַת יִהְיֶה גִּבּוֹר or הַנֹּחֵת. For the impossible הנחת we should, of course, read הַחַת and transl., *let the coward become a hero!* יהיה for juss., Ges. $^{§\,75\,t}$. The strict parall. in v. ^{10}, *let the weakling say, I am a hero!* to which it would form the balancing and complementing hemistich, argues for its originality. Only we should probably correct one גבור to אַבִּיר. The variation in 𝔊, *ἰσχύω* in v. ^{10}, *μαχητής* or *πολεμιστής* in v. ^{11}, may perhaps suggest a difference in the Heb., but it may also be due to the translator's taste.—The sf. in גבוריך was originally כִּי and belongs with the following.—עושו is of unknown meaning. The Vrss. conjectured *assemble yourselves!* 𝔊 𝔗 𝔖, so AE., Ki. But there is no etymological basis for this. The idea of assembling themselves is expressed by ונקבצו. So it has been emended by חושו *hasten*, Menahem, Rashi, or by גֹּשׁוּ, *come near*, Che., or by עורו, *cf.* v. ^{12}, We. But it should be noticed that v. ^{11a} has such a close parall. in v. ^{12a} that they cannot have stood together originally, and one of them must be secondary. V. ^{12a} contains the better text and solves the difficulties occasioned by עושו which is unknown, by ונקבצו which does not fit into the constr., and by שמה which is not explained, for v. ^{2a} is too far removed and the nations must be told where to go. Besides, if v. ^{11a} is omitted, v. ^{11b} is in its right place as the complement of v. ^{10b}.—𝔊^{153} om. from מסביב to the end of the verse. 𝔊^{310} om. מסביב.—**12.** 𝔊 and one Heb. ms. add כל before הגוים, also the variant in v. ^{11a}. This is a correct interpretation but need not be part of the orig. text.—**13.** מַגָּל Ar. *mingalun*, either *sickle* or *pruning-knife*. קָצִיר means usually *the* (*grain*) *harvest*, but Is. $18^{4.\,5}$ Je. 8^{20} it is the *vintage*, so also Is. 16^{9}, whose parall. Je. 48^{32} however has בָּצִיר. It is most likely that we have here only one comparison of judgment, the vintage (Hi.), rather than two, with the grain harvest and the vintage. In view of Is. 16^{9} $18^{4.\,5}$ Je. 8^{20} it seems unnecessary to change קציר to בציר, though the change would be simple. מגל is then of course the *pruning-knife*, and בשל is used of the ripening of the grapes.—באו, Gr. בֹּסוּ, *cf.* Na. 3^{13}, but בוס is never used of the treading out of the grapes and besides the foll. word expresses this.—רְדוּ is taken by 𝔙, AV., RV., Dr., GASm., BDB. as imv. of ירד *go down!* but 𝔊 *πατεῖτε*, 𝔗 רשישו, 𝔖 take it in the sense of *treading*. And this is required by the context. Whether רדה can mean *to tread* is dub., and it is better therefore to read with Gr. דרכו, which is the usual term for this, *cf. e. g.* Is. 63[3].—השיקו היקבים, *the vats overflow*, as in 2[24]. But the overflowing of the vats is the signal for ceasing and not for beginning to press the grapes. Here this cannot be meant. We might take הָשִׁיקוּ transitively, *fill the vats to overflowing!* This would be in line with the preceding imvs., 𝕲 ὑπερεκχεῖτε. The vats become filled as the result of the treading. Then the metaphor would end, as indeed it should, *cf.* Is. 63[3], and כי רבה רעתם would give the reason, but no longer in figurative language, for this process. But in a poetic passage like this the author would not pass so abruptly from the picture to the literal prosaic reason and it is therefore likely that the text read originally, הָרִיקוּ היקבים כי רבה עֶבְרָתָם, *empty the vats! for their overflowing is great.* This would be strictly parall. with the preceding. Why should Yahweh justify the attack to His agents?—The omission of השיקו היקבים as an intrusion from 2[24] (Marti) is unjustifiable.—**14.** המונים המונים, 𝕲 ἦχοι ἐξήχησαν, Jer., *sonitus exauditi sunt* = הָמוּ המונים. The onomatopoetic word-play of the Heb. cannot be reproduced in English. The hum and roar of a great crowd is in it.—החרוץ *strict decision*, 𝕿 𝕲 Θ. It might mean, *threshing instrument*, *cf.* Am. 1[3], and is so taken by many, Cal., Cred., Me. *et al.*, who connect it with v. [13], but wrongly. 𝖁 *concisionis.*—V. [14b] is omitted by a number of Gk. mss. and 𝕲$^{\text{Ald.}}$, whether intentionally or due to homoioteleuton we cannot tell. Perhaps we should read כי קָרֹב יהוה בעמק׳. 𝕲^{49} om. the second בעמק החרוץ.

THE WONDERFUL FERTILITY AND PERMANENT HAPPINESS OF JUDAH IN THE GLORIOUS FUTURE, 4^{18-21} (ENGL. 3^{18-21}).

This is a new section with a new introduction and a new theme. It is not the thought but the lack of originality in the form and its close correspondence to the editor's work that leads us to assign these verses also to the editor. V. [16] had not brought us to a satisfying conclusion. Israel's fate after the judgment had still to be described. Joel may have done this, but not in this manner. If he wrote a description of the ideal future, as is not unlikely, it is lost.

[18]. *And it shall come to pass in that day that*
The mountains shall drop sweet wine,
and the hills shall flow with milk

And all the water-courses of Judah
shall flow with water.
And a spring shall come forth from the house of Yahweh
and water the valley of Shiṭṭim.

19. *Egypt shall be a desolation*
and Edom a desolate steppe,
[For the violence done to the Judeans,
because they shed innocent blood in their land.]
20. *But Judah shall be forever inhabited,*
and Jerusalem for generation upon generation.
21. [And I will avenge their blood (which) I have not (yet) avenged].
And Yahweh shall be dwelling in Zion.

Two strs., (1) consists of a hexameter + a pentameter + a heptameter, the introductory line does not belong to the strophic structure. (2) consists, omitting secondary matter, of two hexameters + a trimeter.

18. *In that day*, the ideal time of blessing which is to follow the judgment, *the mountains shall drop sweet wine, and the hills shall flow* (lit. *go*) *with milk*. An enthusiastic description of the marvellous fertility of the land and the great abundance of its produce. *Cf.* the earlier expression *a land flowing with milk and honey*. The phrases are hyperbolic. The fertility of 2^{21-24} is not to be compared with this miraculous fruitfulness of the messianic age. The sentence is dependent on Am. 9^{13}.* *And all the channels, cf.* 1^{20}, *of Judah shall flow* (perennially) *with water*. Ordinarily these torrent-channels are filled only during the rainy season. *And*, in addition to these streams, *a spring shall come forth out of the house of Yahweh and shall water the Wady of Shiṭṭim*, or *of the Acacias*. Ez. 47^{1-12} had already predicted that a stream would issue from the temple toward the east and through the Kidron valley, gradually swelling to a large river, into the Arabah and finally into the Dead Sea. The banks along the river would be fertilised and the water of the Dead Sea sweetened by the miraculous potency of this life-giving stream. It was a hope that must have found welcome in the heart of every Jerusalemite. The labour for the water supply of the city was one long-drawn-out struggle, and even then the water was not too plentiful. This will be different in the golden age, when Yahweh will really dwell in Zion. Then it will be impossible for the country toward the S. and E. of Jerusalem to be dry and barren, and the Holy City itself without abundance of water. It was an ancient belief that wonderful fertility marked the dwelling-place of a deity. Our author took the special form of this thought from Ezekiel. But he appears to have modified it in one particular, if, as seems probable, the *Wady of Shiṭṭim* is correctly identified with the *Wady es Sanṭ*. Then the river will not flow toward the E. into the Dead Sea, as in Ezekiel, but toward the W. into the Mediterranean through the Wady es Sanṭ which is the direct route from Jerusalem to Gath and Ashkelon. This identification, first suggested by We., is made probable not only by the identity of the names but also by the fact that in Zc. 14[8] the stream flows both toward the E. and the W., into the Dead Sea and the Mediterranean respectively. Zc. 14 who follows here tradition may have combined the conception of Ezekiel with that of Jo. 4. We had reason to believe that Zc. 14 showed the influence of Jo. 4 in the location of the final judgment.—The Wady of Shiṭṭim has often been connected with the *Meadow of Shiṭṭim*, Nu. 33[49] (also called simply *Shiṭṭim*, Jos. 2[1] 3[1] Mi. 6[5]), which is situated in Moab beyond the Jordan and forms a part of the *Ghōr* or Jordan valley. But not only the designation *Wady* is opposed to this but also the consideration that the stream would hardly be thought of as crossing the Jordan. In view of these difficulties the identification with the Wady of the Kidron, through which Ezekiel's river flowed, seemed to commend itself. But what could be the reason for this name which is nowhere else given to the Wady of the Kidron? It has been thought that the name signified an arid Wady because acacias, as Jerome had already noted, grow in dry soil. But while this is doubtless true, the name *Meadow of Acacias* argues against it as the usual connotation. E. H. Palmer, *Sinai*, p. 39, observed that the *seyāl*, one of the many kinds of acacias, is "less dependent on moisture than the palm, though certainly its finest specimens are found near springs."—**19.** In sharp contrast to Judah's wonderful fertility Egypt and Edom will be waste. The dark fate of these countries can only be mentioned as a foil to heighten the glory of Judah's fate. Egypt and Edom must have been included among the nations in the valley of Jehoshaphat. But almost any postexilic Jew would find added joy in the contemplation of Edom's ruin. Egypt may have been specially mentioned because the desolation of the usually so well watered and irrigated country brought out the full wonder of Judah's fertility. But it is also possible that the clause concerning Egypt is not original. The grammatical inelegance of v. [19a], which must be remedied in any case, would favour this. We might think of a reader who added the clause, say after Ptolemy Lagi had invaded Palestine in 320 B.C.—A special reason for Edom's fate is given. That it does not refer to the Egyptians also is indicated by the phrase *on account of the violence done to* the Judeans which reminds one strongly of Obadiah (v. [10]) from whom the editor quoted also in v. [17]. And just as he commented there on the Obadian phrase, so also here by adding *because they shed innocent blood in their land.* This refers to 586 B.C., *cf.* Ob. [14] Ez. 35[5]. *Their land* is, of course, the land of the Judeans, others think it is Egypt and Edom and interpret the clause of massacres of Jews in Egypt and Edom of which we have no further knowledge. That the killing was not done in battle is clear from the term *they shed innocent blood*, which implies murder. Perhaps *by murdering them* stood in the orig. text instead of *in their land.* With the last clause of v. [19] the first of v. [21] is closely connected.—**21a.** *And I will avenge their blood* (*which*) *I have not* (*yet*) *avenged.* This reading, based on 𝔊 𝔖, is superior to 𝔐's, *And I will hold as innocent* (RVm.) *their blood which I have not held as innocent.* The writer did not think that the Edomites had been sufficiently punished for their brutal behaviour toward Judah and he expected therefore their punishment in the near future. It is evident that a sentence like this has no real place after vv. [9 ff.]. It stood originally directly after v. [19b]. It is a part of a *direct* speech of Yahweh which is introduced suddenly and unexpectedly in the editor's manner, *cf.* 2[27] 4[17]. Perhaps vv. [19b. 21a] are still later additions.—**20.** *But Judah shall be inhabited forever,* lit. *dwell*, the Heb. idiom for a flourishing city or country, *cf.* Is. 13[20] Je. 17[6. 25] Zc. 9[5] 12[6]. *And Jerusalem for generations and generations.*—**21b.** *And Yahweh* (*shall be*) *dwelling in Zion*, *cf.* 2[27] 4[17]. Yahweh's abiding presence is the basis and guarantee of Judah's happiness and permanent security.

---

* *Cf.* the similar descriptions in Ho. $2^{23\ ff.}$ 14^{6-8}, also in classical authors: Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 113 *ff.*, Vergil, *Eclog.* IV, 21 *ff.*, *Georg.* I, 125, Ovid, *Metam.* I, 111 *f.*, *Flumina iam lactis, iam flumina nectaris ibant, Flavaque de viridi stillabant ilice mella.*

16. ומעום 𝔊 *καὶ ἐνισχύσει* = מְעַז. Siev. om. v. ^{16b} as "*anerkannt*" not genuine, but it cannot be spared. Bu., *ZAW*., 1910, pp. 37 *ff*., maintains that Jo. 4^{16} quoted from Am. 1^{2}, not *vice versa*. But note the quotation from Am. 9^{13} in v. ^{18}.—**17.** 𝔊$^{62.\ 147}$ om. בציון. 𝔊$^{68.\ \mathrm{Ald.}}$ om. from שכן to קדשי, Siev. om. this and אלהיכם.—**19.** Now.^{K} om. the second תהיה in the interest of the style. Du. om. מצרים לש׳ תהיה. Marti, Now.^{K} om. from אשר to בארצם. For בארצם read בְּרִצְחָם (?).—נקיא so here and Jon. 1^{14} for נקי which several codd. read. The Masora notes this orthography in both places.—Vv. $^{19.\ 20}$ are missing in 𝔊$^{95.\ 185}$.—**21.** ונקיתי דמם לא נקיתי, *and I will declare, hold as, innocent their blood* (*which*) *I have not declared, held as, innocent*, or *and I will leave unpunished their blood* (*which*) *I have not left unpunished*. This is evidently wrong. 𝔊^{BN} *ἐκζητήσω*, 𝔊$^{AQ^{a}}$ *ἐκδικήσω* = וְנִקַּמְתִּי for the first נקיתי, *and I will avenge their blood, I will not leave it unpunished, cf.* 𝔖. But the tense of the second נקיתי does not favour this. For it would be a proph. pf., which is not used in the context. It is best to read with Eich., We., Marti נִקַּמְתִּי also for the second נקיתי, *I will avenge their blood, which I have not* (*yet*) *avenged*. The sudden change to the 1st pers. would indicate the secondary character of the clause (Marti, Du.), if it were not the editor's manner. It belongs after v. ^{19b}.—Ew., GASm., Dr. take v. ^{21b} as an oath, but this would be most unusual.

INDEXES TO OBADIAH AND JOEL.

I. HEBREW WORDS.

ארבה, 76.
את, 44.

בצע, 102 *f.*

גזם, 76.

החל, 44.
הצפוני, 118 *f.*

חגוים, 38.
חלשׁ, 138.
חסיל, 76.

ידד, 41.
ילק, 76.

כל־בשר, 123.

לוע, לעע, 43

מגל, 139.
מגרפה, 90.
מורה, 120.
מזור, 40.
מנגר, 41, 88.
מסלה, 102.
משל, 118.

נבא, 122, 126.
נחת, 139.
נכר, 42.
נפל, 102.
נקיא, 144.

ספרד, 45.

עבט, 102.
עבשׁ, 90.
עלה, 46.
עמק, 128, 130.
עסים, 79.
ערג, 92.

פליטה, 101.
פרדה, 90.
פרק, 42.

צחנה, 119.
ציר, 38.

קבץ פארור, 101.
קציר, 139.
קצף, 79.

רדה, 139 *f.*
רמה, 38.

שׁדי, 87
שׁפט, 45
שׁקק, 103.

שׂריג, 79.

תפלצת, 34 *n*

II. SUBJECTS AND NAMES.

ALEXANDER the Great, 60.
Alexander Jannæus, 9.
Ammonites, 9, 31.
Antiochus the Great, 45.
Antiochus Epiphanes, 45.
Arabians; see Nabateans.
Aristobulus I, 9.
Artaxerxes Ochus, 45, 60, 61.

BRIDE, bridegroom, 109.

CULT; see Sacrifices.

DAY of Yahweh, interpolations of, 50 *ff.*, 65, 86 *f.*, 93 *f.*, 95 *f.*, 103 *f.*
Dispersion, 45.

EDOM, 1 *ff.*, *passim*, 142 *f.*
Egypt, 142 *f.*
Ephraim, field of, 31.

FASTING, 85.

GAZA, 60.
Gebal, 39.
Gilead, 31, 45.
Greeks, 54 *f.*, 60, 131 *f.*

ḤALAḤ, 32, 45.

JEHOSHAPHAT, valley of, 128.
Jerusalem, destruction of, in 586 B.C., 10, 26 *f.*, 53, 55, 130.
Joel, prophet, 67 *f.*
Joel, book: composition, 49 *ff.*; date, 56 *ff.*; interpretation, 62 *ff.*; text, 68; metre, 68 *ff.*; position in canon, 57.
John Hyrcanus, 9.

LIBATION, 81, 106.
Locusts, 74 *ff.*, *passim*.

MEAL-OFFERING, 81, 106.
Mount Esau, Mount Seir, 8, 21 *f.*, 31, 32.

NABATEANS, 7, 9, 10, 11, 22, 23.
Negeb, 29, 31.
Northerner, 51, 111, 118 *f.*

OBADIAH, prophet, 13 *ff.*
Obadiah, book: composition, 1 *ff.* date, 6 *ff.*; interpretation, 10 *ff.*; place in canon, 14 *n.*; text, 15; metre, 15 *ff.*; comparison with Je. 49, 33 *ff.*

PENTECOST, 123 *f.*
Petra, 21, 22.
Phœnicians, 54 *f.*, 60 *f.*, 130 *ff.*
Philistines, 31, 54 *f.*, 60, 130 *ff.*

RAIN, 116 *f.*
Reṣeph, 45.

SACRIFICES, Joel's attitude to, 81, 106.
Samaritans, 9.
Šaparda; see Sepharad.
Sarephath, Sarepta, 31 *f.*
Selah, 21.
Sepharad, 32, 45 *f.*
Shephelah, 31.
Shiṭṭim, valley of, 141 *f.*
Sidon, 60 *f.*
Sippar, 46.
Slave-trade, 54 *f.*
Spirit, 122 *f.*

TEMAN, 26.
Threshing-floor, 116.
Tyre, 60.

VISION, 19.

WINE-PRESS, 116.
Wine-vat, 116.

SCHEELE MEMORIAL LIBRARY
3 6655 00038040 2
BS491 .I6 v.26
Smith, J. M. Powis /Critical a

BS 491 .I6 v.26
Smith, J. M. Powis 1866-1932

A critical and exegetical
commentary on Micah.

DATE DUE

Concordia College Library
Bronxville, NY 10708